FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 214

5 November 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Rogers Exploits Congress' Decision on CW Funding [Bogachev] AA 1
U.S. Reported Not To Discuss SDI at Geneva Talks AA 1
Chernyshev Outlines Progress of SDI Program [Bratislava PRAVDA 24 Oct] AA 2
Political Dialogue Required for Arms Race End [Kornilov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Oct] AA 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Shishlin Extols Pact Stand on Arms, Other Issues BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Editorial on Communist Movement's Peaceful Stance [PRAVDA 4 Nov] CC 1
Socialist World Endorses Soviet Peace Effort [Baygarov in PRAVDA 2 Nov] CC 2
Reportage, Comment on UNESCO Session in Sofia CC 3
Arab-Israeli Issue CC 3
UK Delegate's Remarks CC 4
[Zakharko in IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Interview With Soviet Journalists Published A 1
'Text' of Interview A 1
[IZVESTIYA 5 Nov]
Journalists' Report A 11
[Shishkin, Ovchinnikov, Kondrashov, Borovik in IZVESTIYA 5 Nov]
Shultz, Shevardnadze Discuss 'Security Issues' A 21
Shultz Meets With Gorbachev A 22
Yurchenko Discusses 'Defection' With Press A 22
U.S. Supports Terrorism in Move Against Qadhdhafi A 24

CHINA

U.S. Imperialist Threat to China Cited [Volskiy] B 1
PRC-U.S. Helicopter Manufacturing Deal Signed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Nov] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

U.S. Nuclear-Powered Submarine Leaves Yokosuka C 1

Kharkov Analysis C 1
Commentary Views Role of U.S. Bases on Okinawa C 1
[Dmitriyev]
KCNA Cited on Europeans' View of Korean 'Danger' C 3
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 1 Nov]

SOUTH ASIA

DRA's Karmal Receives Tajik SSR's Makhkamov D 1
[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]
DRA Protests Iranians' Attack in Border Area D 1
U.S. Aid to Afghan Rebels Condemned D 1
Discord Among U.S. Supporters of Afghan Rebels Viewed D 2
[Sugurchev]
DRA Reception Held for Soviet Servicemen D 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Oct]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Reportage on Lao Defense Minister's Activities E 1
Tours Kubinka Air Force Unit E 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]
Visits Officer Training Course E 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Nov]
Visits Novosibirsk, Departs E 2
Ryabov, Malaysian Leaders Discuss Ties, Indochina E 2
Kochanov Reviews SRV Ties on Treaty Anniversary E 3
Analyst Assesses U.S. 'Adventure' in Vietnam E 4
[Yakovlev]

EASTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA Reports Cooperation Pact With GDR F 1
[1 Nov]
CPSU Workers Study MSZMP Party Building F 2
[PRAVDA 3 Nov]
E. Europe Parties, States Hail Warsaw Pact Parley F 2
GDR's Honecker F 2
[PRAVDA 3 Nov]
Czechoslovak Party, Government F 3
[PRAVDA 1 Nov]
PRAVDA Reports Polish-Romanian Talks in Warsaw F 4
[1Nov]
IZVESTIYA Cites GDR-PRC Cooperation Talks [2 Nov] F 4
Kadar Ends UK Talks, Notes Sides 'Differed' F 4

WESTERN EUROPE

BILD Publishes Parts of Gorbachev Letter to Kohl G 1
[4 Nov]
Scottish Business Delegation Ends Visit G 2
Agricultural Protocol Signed With Finland G 3
UK Conservatives Policy Leads To 'Adventures' G 3
[Matyash]
UK Concludes Agreement on SDI at Brussels Meeting G 4
[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]
Swedish Security Service Follows Leftists G 5
[Vukolov]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Diplomats Kidnapped in Beirut Return to Moscow H 1
Falasha Trial in Sudan Exposes U.S. Role H 1
Vardzelashvili, Iraqi Official Discuss Relations H 1
[INA]
U.S., Israel 'Sabotaging' Near East Settlement H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Mozambique Party, Government Delegation Arrives J 1
Met by Shevardnadze, Ponomarev J 1
Visits Leningrad J 1
E. African Leaders Discuss Ugandan Situation J 1
[PRAVDA 28 Oct]
U.S. Proposes More Aid for 'Terrorist' UNITA J 2
[Knyazkov]
South African Security Situation Reviewed J 3
[Ryasova]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. 'Effrontery' Toward Nicaragua Decried K 1
[Kamorin in IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Further Comment on Draft CPSU Statutes R 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial [3 Nov] R 1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editorial [3 Nov] R 2
Construction Mismanagement, Embezzlement Discussed R 5
[IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]
Shevarnadze Speeches Published in Pamphlet R 6
Party, Other Appointments Announced R 6
First Deputy Broadcast Chairman R 6
[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTAV SSSR]
Stavropol First Secretary R 6
[PRAVDA 5 Nov]
Khakass Obkom First Secretary R 7
[PRAVDA 5 Nov]
Kiev Obkom Leader 'Released' R 7
Kirghiz First Secretary R 7
Kirghiz Forestry Committee Chairman R 7
[SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 15 Oct]
Uzbek Friendship Society Chairman R 7
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 19 Oct]
Israeli Article Cited on Jewish Emigration Issue R 8
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Oct]
Grishin Attends Moscow Gorkom Meeting R 8
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Oct]
Azerbaijan Central Committee Member Dies in Accident R 8
[BAKINSKIY RAVOCHIY 20 Oct]
Briefs: Tractor Minister Decorated; R 8
Tajik Alcoholism Clinic; R 8
Uzbek Red Crescent Society; R 9
Arkhangelsk Oblast TV Relay R 9

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

CSA on Potato, Cotton Procurement Problems T 1
Agricultural Developments for 31 Oct-2 Nov T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

IZVESTIYA Draws Lessons from Tajik Earthquake U 1
[Surkov 28 Oct]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Arkhipov Addresses Anniversary Parade Troops V 1
Ceremonial Meeting of GOSR Parade Troops Held V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Nov]

ROGERS EXPLOIT CONGRESS' DECISION ON CW FUNDING

LD041920 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 4 Nov 85

["Eating One's Pie and Having It?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 4 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Supreme Allied Commander Europe General Rogers is by right considered one of the zealots of the idea to turn Western Europe into an arsenal of U.S. chemical agents. But recently he stunned the newspaper FRANKFURTHER RUNDSCHAU by allowing in an interview the possibility of withdrawing the stockpiles of U.S. chemical weapons from the territories of the U.S. European allies.

However, there are no grounds to take the statement by the U.S. general at face value. It seems that this twist in Rogers's views has been caused by the decision taken under U.S. public pressure by the Aropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to strike out of the draft military budget the funds requested for the production of binary chemical weapons. Moreover, the West European public is strongly opposed to the U.S. plans to turn Western Europe into a huge "gas chamber."

Refusing funds for the production of chemical agents, the congressmen stated, however, that the ban on the production of binary munitions in the USA was to be in effect until the U.S. Administration secured the consent of its West European allies to the deployment of these chemical weapons in their territories.

It is this provision that General Rogers decided to exploit. He explained that before the United States withdrew its chemical agents from Western Europe, the U.S. Congress should approve funding for the production of binary weapons -- and then the fate of nerve gases deployed in NATO countries could be decided.

Rogers's new proposal on chemical weapons obviously is aimed solely at facilitating the development of large-scale production of new chemical munitions in the USA and at quietly introducing them in Western Europe in the future through U.S. bases in West Germany, Britain and other NATO countries.

What the general proposes is first to eat his pie and then to see if he also could have it.

U.S. REPORTED NOT TO DISCUSS SDI AT GENEVA TALKS

LD041835 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 4 TASS -- The U.S. Administration is not going to discuss at the talks in Geneva the "Strategic Defence Initiative" which envisages the deployment of space strike arms. This stand of the USA has been confirmed by representatives of the White House at a closed-door briefing for SDI supporters from various conservative organizations. According to THE Washington POST, the briefing was held prior to the Soviet-U.S. summit in order to publicize the programme of "star wars."

CHERNYSHEV OUTLINES PROGRESS OF SDI PROGRAM

AU291348 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 24 Oct 85 p 6

[Article by Colonel Vladimir Chernyshev, candidate of technical sciences: "First Salvos of U.S. Star Wars; The Start of the Practical Implementation of U.S. President R. Reagan's So-Called Strategic Defense Initiative Is an Attack on the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty"]

[Text] Trying to vindicate its activity aimed at the practical implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, Washington is falsifying and interpreting in a distorted manner the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on antimissile weapons. The President's national security adviser, R. McFarlane, for example, has declared without any foundation that the treaty "does not ban scientific research, testing, and even the preparation of certain weapons based on other operational principles." As has been written by THE BOSTON GLOBE, U.S. officials "claim that to determine the feasibility of SDI, it is possible to make tests of subcomponents, parts, and even entire experimental systems." Because the U.S. Administration wants to test its models of this new generation of arms systems at any price, it is resorting to all sorts of tricks and dirty methods. According to the well-known U.S. expert P. Clausen, the Reagan administration is trying to reconcile technology tests with the provisions of the ABM Treaty, among other things, by renaming the systems it wants to test as "subcomponents" or "supplementary elements." Washington has even come up with a special [illegible]curing term -- "demonstrative tests" -- for this purpose, which none of its authors is able to explain. In reality, the "star wars" program contains a great number of experiments that amount to combat tests.

The United States has already carried out a series of experiments and tests which, as U.S. officials have admitted, are of great importance for the implementation of the "star wars" program.

Laser weapons are one such example. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, as early as 1973 the U.S. Air Force used strong lasers to destroy the maquette of an aircraft at Kirtland Air Base. The U.S. Army has used lasers to destroy air defense missiles. The Air Force now has at its disposal a 400,000-watt laser on board a KC-135 airplane. It has destroyed missiles of the Sidewinder class by using thermal laser beams to render their electronic systems inoperative.

On 6 September this year, preliminary tests of the miracle laser weapons were carried out at the White Sands (New Mexico) missile range under virtually real combat conditions. These weapons are being developed within the framework of the "star wars" program and can be used in space. A stage of the Titan-2 intercontinental missile was destroyed with a laser beam. General James Abrahamson spoke about this with enthusiasm, declaring that the laser beam "split that part literally to pieces" and that the test "proved the correctness of all calculations." U.S. media were very open in evaluating this event as one step on the road toward "star wars" and an attempt by Washington to poison the atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva.

Other experiments that are dangerous for peace, involving X-ray lasers with a nuclear charge, are taking place in a special shaft in the state of Nevada. The new lethal device has been named Excalibur. The well-known U.S. commentator, J. Kraft has stressed that one of the main reasons for the U.S. Administration's refusal to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions is its unwillingness to halt precisely the development of X-ray lasers. The last set of documents the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency submitted to the U.S. Congress flatly states "the systems of directed-energy weapons require nuclear tests." The French newspaper LE FIGARO pointedly called experimentation with laser weapons "the first salvos of 'star wars.'"

This May the first test of an electromagnetic gun was carried out, during which the charge reached a speed of 40 km per second. In an article published in the Italian newspaper IL TEMPO, General J. Abrahamson declared that production of the first models of these weapons would start soon.

However, the Pentagon is not confining its dangerous activities just to the ground and underground. The multiple-use spaceships of the space shuttle system are finding broad use. This June the spaceship Discovery carried a mirror to reflect laser beams. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, some variants of space antimissile weapons systems provide for large mirrors placed in orbit which receive strong beams from lasers on the ground and reflect them in the direction of missiles and nuclear warheads in order to destroy them. It was precisely this concept that was being tested with the help of the space shuttle Discovery. The beam of the laser which was located at a U.S. air base on the island of Maui (Hawaii), was targeted on the front part of the spaceship, and was held on its reflecting surface for 2 and 1/2 minutes. The experiment was designed to determine the degree of distortion and the loss of energy incurred by the laser beam in the atmosphere and to verify the possibility of "keeping" the beam on a moving target.

The world has assessed these experiments as new tests of the "star wars" technology and further practical steps on the road to the implementation of the extensive program of militarizing outer space. According to THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, the Pentagon and the officials in charge of the "star wars" program attribute great significance to such tests, viewing them as the first stage to "even more expensive and complicated operations involving the use of lasers and missiles."

The Pentagon's immediate plans provide, for example, for launching the Til Ruby satellite into orbit during the March 1986 space flight of the space shuttle Discovery. This satellite will be equipped with sensitive detectors for ascertaining [the location of] aircraft and missiles. In the program of creating offensive space weapons, an important role is ascribed to this equipment. The spaceship will also carry a cryogenic gyroscope; a spectral analysis of the earth's atmosphere is to be carried out with the help of this special equipment. The Pentagon believes all this information is of great importance for the creation of a missile monitoring system.

Starting in 1987, every year two flights of the multiple-use spaceships will be used for "extensive" experiments according to the "star wars" program. But this is, so to speak, only the "official" part. According to J. Abrahamson, the Pentagon also hopes to use commercial flights as well as NASA-organized flights for these experiments "without running any great risk of abolishing the secrecy of SDI."

An important space experiment is being planned for the June 1987 space shuttle flight. As was announced by J. Abrahamson in an interview for AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY, a laser beam directed via the spacelab's illuminator will be reflected by mirrors placed on the spaceship's surface mantle and targeted on a satellite or other target in space to test the aiming system. As the journal noted, the experiment will make it possible to test the functioning of individual components of the antimissile weapons system involving elements of bases in space and to prepare the ground for the deployment of weapons in space.

The United States is now studying the question of producing and launching into orbit -- by means of a multiple-use spaceship -- the Kemsat satellite and a group of multiprob satellites in 1987. They will be designed to test the impact of beams from ground lasers sent into space.

In the near future the Pentagon is planning new large-scale experiments with components of offensive space weapons. During the experiments, the beam of a laser located on the peak of a mountain on the island of Maui will be targeted on Tere-Malamut missiles equipped with special laser beam reflectors and launched from the Barking Sands Polygon (Hawaii) to a height of 576 km. These tests will again take place within the framework of the development of weapons capable of destroying, by means of reflected beams, targets in space as well as on the ground.

The test of the ASAT antisatellite system against a real target in space, carried out on 13 September, cannot be assessed any other way than as an action immediately leading to the start of the deployment of offensive space weapons. It is clear that the aim is not only to acquire weapons for an antimissile war as soon as possible but to also test, in the form of testing antisatellite systems, the antimissile devices of air and other kinds of bases, which are banned by the ABM treaty.

Everything we have said so far clearly demonstrates that all the pronouncements of U.S. representatives about the "compatability" of projects within the framework of the "star wars" program with the ABM Treaty are nothing but empty words. Other statements by representatives of the U.S. Administration are closer to reality -- for example, Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger declared without hesitation that should the ABM Treaty be an obstacle to, or stand in the way of, the implementation of Washington's plans, the worse for the treaty.

It clearly follows from the latest statements by high-ranking Washington representatives that, just as previously, they refuse to reach an agreement on averting the arms race in space and do not want to remove the deaf wall [hlucha stena] -- their "star wars" program -- that stands in the way of attainment of an agreement on nuclear weapons in Geneva. Moreover, by trying to undermine the ABM Treaty, Washington is striving to destroy the basis on which the process of limiting and reducing arms rests.

However, no maneuvering whatsoever will help the lovers of "star wars" conceal the fact that their activity is aimed at upsetting strategic stability, unleashing a new round of the arms race, and increasing the danger of a nuclear catastrophe in space. The "salvos" of "star wars" can be heard all over the world.

POLITICAL DIALOGUE REQUIRED FOR ARMS RACE END

PM311602 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Oct 85 First Edition p 1

[Yuriy Kornilov "International Review": "Strategy of Peace" -- uppercase passage published in boldface]

[Text] "There is no loftier and more responsible mission," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program stresses, "than to defend and strengthen peace and curb the forces of aggression and militarism for the sake of the lives of present and future generations. A WORLD WITHOUT WARS AND WITHOUT WEAPONS IS THE SOCIALIST IDEAL." That is our strategic course. It is fully shared and supported by all the fraternal communist parties in the socialist community countries. The main aim of the Warsaw Pact states' foreign policy has been and continues to be to remove the threat of nuclear war, reduce the level of military confrontation, and develop international relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente. That is stated in the socialist countries' statement adopted at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference that ended in Sofia last week. This precise formula reflects the hopes and aspirations of all who value clear skies over the planet. It expresses the very essence and core of socialist foreign policy and diplomacy. "History," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech to Bulgarian machine builders, "has placed a special responsibility on the socialist countries.

Indeed, there is no other such mighty force capable of restraining the aggressive circles of imperialism and preventing it from pitching mankind into the abyss of nuclear war."

The world's public and press are focusing on the results of the Sofia forum. That is natural and law-governed. If people on any continent and in any country are asked what a better world means to them, it can boldly be claimed that -- irrespective of the differences in their philosophy, ideology, and national and cultural traditions -- they will all first and foremost agree on one thing: A better world is a world without fear of a nuclear catastrophe and a world free from nuclear missile, chemical, space, and any other types of weapons. This truth was true yesterday, and it is doubly and triply true today when such mountains of weapons have been accumulated on the planet that were they brought into action the very fate of human civilization would be threatened. In extensively discussing and commenting on the Warsaw Pact statement, prominent politicians and public figures in various countries and the press are noting that the Soviet Union and its friends and allies have reaffirmed their inexorable will to remove the threat of nuclear self-immolation and advocated a resolute turn for the better in the present alarming development of international affairs.

The Sofia forum stressed quite definitely that, now that international tension has sharply increased and the world has approached a line beyond which events might get out of control, it is necessary for the policy of confrontation to be ended and for all states to strictly observe the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty and the nonuse of force or the threat of force. A turn for the better in international affairs requires a new approach in policy corresponding to the realities of the modern world. Urgent measures are now needed which would make it possible to stop the arms race and prevent it from spreading to space. The wide range of large-scale initiatives from the socialist Warsaw Pact states is aimed at achieving these goals. The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit is called upon to promote an easing of the present dangerous tension in the world and a reduction in the threat of war. The fraternal socialist countries are convinced that however varied the world's political and social complexion may be, all countries are now facing the need to seek ways toward a peace which would be characterized by trust.

The peace offensive of socialist foreign policy and diplomacy is welcomed by all who value the idea of detente. But, this offensive is encountering fierce opposition from those who are not interested in improving the political climate. If now, when there are a few weeks to go until the Soviet-U.S. summit, one had to sum up the way Washington was responding to the Soviet foreign policy initiatives, the picture, unfortunately, would be by no means the way that the Soviet and international public would like to see it. Yes, there has been a definite shift: The Soviet proposals are no longer being rejected, as happened before, from the outset with the stereotyped exclamation: "Propaganda!" Sober and realistic thinking is obviously maturing in U.S. public opinion, political circles, and the Congress. But, at the same time there are certain trends which cannot fail to cause suspicion and, more than that, alarm. For however the Washington elite may twist and turn on the subject of "U.S. adherence to the cause of peace and arms control," facts are facts: From the start of the Geneva talks until now, the U.S. side has not made a single new proposal. However U.S. foreign policy-makers may try to cloak themselves in "dovish" attire, you cannot close your eyes to the fact that the U.S. military budget for fiscal 1986 exceeded 300 billion dollars -- a record sum in the country's history. In the period since 6 August, when the USSR decision to unilaterally end all nuclear explosions came into effect, the United States has carried out four underground nuclear tests in succession -- this means the architects of the policy of force intend to continue to fill the U.S. and NATO nuclear bunkers with more and more sophisticated tools of death and destruction.

Washington's line of militarizing space is arousing particular concern.

If it is not blocked, it will inevitably lead to the destabilization of the entire political situation and will turn space into a new source of deadly danger for mankind. That is precisely how sober-minded politicians and eminent scientists are assessing the U.S. plans for preparing for "star wars." Here are just a few statements on that score. Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. SALT II talks: "The 'star wars' program is nothing other than an effective means invented by the Reagan administration for killing off arms control." H. Bethe, one of the most important U.S. physicists and Nobel Prize winner: "SDI will never create an effective system for the defense of the United States, but the very attempt to construct an ABM shield will inevitably provoke legitimate suspicions in the USSR about our intention to inflict a first nuclear strike by hiding behind this shield."

"Fear and disaray" was how Gus Hall, leader of the U.S. Communists, described the reaction of the enemies of detente to the peace offensive of socialist foreign policy; indeed, it is hard to escape the impression that some people in the United States have been gripped by fear of the very possibility of accords in Geneva and having to reduce arms production and moderate military appetites. Incidentally, the identities of those in the United States who play the role of generators of militarism are no secret. They are not only the right-wing conservative reactionary circles of the Republican Party and not only the Pentagon -- that headquarters for the "war hawks" tasked with manning, arming, and ideologically conditioning the aggression-oriented U.S. Armed Forces. Behind the "hawks" who have made their nests on Washington's political Olympus stands U.S. big business and its core -- the powerful military-industrial corporations. In 5 years the joint profits of the 10 leading U.S. arms companies have grown by 150 percent.

"We proceed on the basis that only a stable and reliable policy is worthy of parties and states which recognize their responsibility for the fate of peace in our contradiction-crammed era," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum. The socialist Warsaw Pact states, full of a sense of high responsibility for the future of the planet, are firmly following the line of maintaining and strengthening peace. What can be expected from our partners? Will they show good political sense and a genuine will for an improvement in the international situation, or, remaining captive to belligerent imperial concepts and hegemonic postulates, will they continue to threaten the world with a universal catastrophe in an attempt to steer the ship we call the earth into the deep waters of militarism and the dark whirlpools of anticommunist hysteria?

The answer to this question will be provided by the future. But, today one thing is obvious: Political dialogue is needed -- dialogue that is serious, constructive, and imbued with a sincere desire to reveal areas of contiguous and balanced interests and, extirpating the material roots of mutual suspicion and mistrust, with joint efforts to save the world from a nuclear conflagration.

SHISHLIN EXTOLS PACT STAND ON ARMS, OTHER ISSUES

LD011258 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- "The Warsaw Treaty member-countries express their approach to the international problems in actions and specific proposals, in a precise and clear-cut system of priorities, emphasis being laid on the problems of putting an end to the arms race on earh and preventing it in outer space", Nikolay Shishlin points out in his article in the latest issue of the NEW TIMES weekly of foreign policy analysis, evaluating the results of the meeting of the political consultative committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, which was held in Sofia a week ago.

The author of the article draws attention to the realistic and precise assessment of the situation in Europe and the world: "The world has approached a line beyond which events may get out of control. This is a direct consequence of the impetuous growth of the arms race, which has again been accelerated in recent years as a result of the policy of the United States aimed at ensuring military superiority. There is no area in the production of deadly weapons in which the USA would not build up its efforts. Now it is out to add space strike weapons to those placed on seas, in aircraft and on land".

"To make disarmament a reality, it is necessary in the first place to stop the inertia of the arms race. And there is no other method, no other way but to terminate the implementation of the present-day military programmes, freeze them", the author goes on.

"The socialist states represented at the meeting are ready for active collaboration with all sides concerned for the speediest settlement of the existing complex situation and preventing the emergence of new seats of tension in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other areas of the world.

To ensure that it be so, there is the right way to act: It is necessary to put an end to the imperialist positions of strength policy and interference in the internal affairs of other states, to acts of aggression, resolve complex situations and disputes between states peacefully, strictly honour the right of every people to decide its destiny on its own", Nikolay Shishlin points out.

EDITORIAL ON COMMUNIST MOVEMENT'S PEACEFUL STANCE

PM041059 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Nov 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Banner of October, Banner of Peace"]

[Text] Our motherland is greeting the 68th anniversary of Great October at a new political stage. The young, forward-moving world of socialism is confidently following the path of communist creation.

The greater the heights our country scales in communist building, the stronger its international positions and the more beneficial an influence the motherland of October exerts on the course of world development. The October Revolution, as V.I. Lenin sagaciously noted, opened up a new epoch -- an epoch of struggle "for the liberation of the peoples from imperialism, for the end of wars among peoples, for the overthrow of the domination of capital, and for socialism."

While effecting a world historic shift from capitalism to socialism, the October Revolution at the same time marked a turning point in the resolution of the mostburning problem for the peoples -- the problem of war and peace. For the first time in history a society emerged whose ideal was a world without wars and without weapons.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries place their might and their tremendous international authority in the service of resolving the vitally important task of our time -- the prevention of the threat of nuclear war. Communists have never intended to resolve the historical argument between the two opposing social systems by force of arms. Socialism proves and will continue to prove its advantages by force of example. The USSR's efforts are aimed at chanelling interstate relations into peaceful competition and equitable cooperation.

The range of new large-scale peace proposals put forward recently by the Soviet Union has riveted the attention of the planet s peoples. Certain circles in the imperialist camp are vainly attempting to distort the content of the Soviet initiatives and belittle their significance. The Soviet Union honestly and sincerely advocates talks with the United States and other Western partners, it advocates a political dialogue. It is not an attempt to influence public opinion but the most serious of intentions which are behind the Soviet proposals. The Soviet Union's position at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva is clear: The USSR advocates preventing an arms race in space and negotiating with the United States for a mutual reduction of the corresponding nuclear weapons based on the principle of equality and identical security.

One result of the October Revolution and the historic victory over Hitlerite fascism is that the potential of the forces of peace has grown and multiplied immeasureably. In the international arena the socialist community now acts as a most authoritative force of the present day without which it is impossible to resolve any questions of world politics. The commmunity of fraternal countries is a firm bulwark of peace on earth and the main obstacle in the path of imperialist reaction.

The 22-23 October Sofia conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, which adopted the programmatic document "For the Elimination of the Nuclear Threat and a Change for the Better in European and World Affairs," was an international event of paramount importance. In conditions of the tense and at times explosive situation in Europe and the world, the leaders of the socialist states have oulined real ways of reducing the threat of war and returning international relations to the channel of detente.

The conference unanimously supported the Soviet Union's major new initiatives in the disarmament sphere and confirmed the commonality of the positions of the fraternal parties and countries on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

The communist movement -- a highly influential ideological and political force of the present day -- is in the forefront of the struggle for the interests of the working people and the preservation of peace on earth. The overwhelming majority of states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are vitally interested in preserving peace and halting the arms race. The antiwar movement of the broadest people's masses on all continents has become an influential factor of public life. A sober consideration of the real correlation of forces is leading to an understanding of the danger of the arms race on the part of many statesmen and politicians of the capitalist states too.

The threat to peace posed by the policy of imperialism's aggressive circles is great. However, there is no fatal inevitability of world war. It is possible to avert the catastrophe of war. The CPSU and the Soviet state and all our people are devoting their efforts precisely to this noble cause.

"The peace-loving foreign policy course elaborated by the party and consistently pursued by the Soviet state in combination with the strengthening of the country's defense capability has guaranteed the Soviet people and the majority of the planet's population a peaceful life for the longest period in the 20th century," the draft of the new edition of the CPSU program says. "The CPSU will continue to do everything in its power to preserve the peaceful conditions of Soviet people's creative work, to improve international relations to halt the arms race that has overwhelemed the world, and to avert the threat of nuclear war which hangs over the peoples."

The CPSU Central Committee October slogan finds a broad response:

"Long live the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy -- the policy of consolidating peace and the peoples' security, the policy of broad internatinal cooperation!"

SOCIALIST WORLD ENDORSES SOVIET PEACE EFFORT

PM041140 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[Sergey Baygarov "Commentator's Column": "General Position"]

[Text] There is no more urgent task today than to defend peace on the planet. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are in the vanguard of the struggle against the threat of nuclear war. The whole world knows of the Soviet proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. These are primarily proposals for a total ban on space strike weapons and a radical 50-percent reduction in those nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States which can reach each other's territory.

All the socialist community countries have unanimously supported the Soviet Union's major new initiatives in the disarmament sphere, and they have reaffirmed the commonality of positions of the fraternal parties and countries on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. This is demonstrated by the documents of the Sofia conference of the Political Consultative Committee and by statements from the fratneral countries' highest party and state figures.

During the just-ended Soviet-Cuban talks in Havana, F. Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and president of the Republic's Councils of State and Ministers, highly appraised the USSR's peace-loving policy and the CPSU's course of consolidating peace.

The socialist countries are fully determined to prevent anyone from achieving military superiority over them and are persistently seeking to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe and in the world as a whole. A statement by the Mongolian Peace Defense Commitee expresses the determination to step up the efforts of that country's public in support of the just struggle of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and of all peace-loving forces to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The socialist world has again proposed a broad and clear program: detente instead of tension; constructive, businesslike dialogue instead of confrontation; restraint instead of arms race; and, instead of the threat of force and the use of violence, peaceful relations and mutually advantageous cooperation. The substantial range of proposals on key problems which has come aout thanks to the joint efforts of the socialist community countries has established itself in the consciousness of the broad world public as an alternative to the imperialist course. There are over 100 initiativesaimed at reducing arms and strengthening world peace to the credit of the socialist countries. Their implementation could lead to the normalization of the complex and dangerous international situation.

The socialist countries are a politically monolithic force and an active champion of the strengthening of peace on earth.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON UNESCO SESSION IN SOFIA

Arab-Israeli Issue

LD312124 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 31 Oct 85

[Text] Sofia, October 31 TASS -- The 23rd Session of the UNESCO general conference, which is under way in Sofia, has started the discussion in its Fifth Commission implementation of the UNESCO's resolutions as to the status of educational and cultural institutions on the occupied Arab lands. This problem is, perhaps, one of the most pressing in UNESCO's activities, stressed delegates of Arab countries, non-aligned states, speaking in the general discussion. The note that despite repeated condemnation of insolent and arrogant actions of the Tel Aviv ruling Zionist leadership with regard to occupied Arab lands, Israel continues stubbornly conducting the course of genocide towards Arab peoples, their cultural legacy, it is hampering the development of education and public health systems there, plundering and destroying historical values, closing educational establishments everywhere, in Gaza and the West Bank of the River Jordan, grossly violating their activities.

Speaking in the discussion, Anatoliy Zlenko, a representative of the Ukrainian SSR, emphasised that the causes of such a conduct on the part of the invaders were obvious. Israel's aggression became possible owing to Washington's direct support. The interventionists are receiving huge military, political and moral aid from the United States and a number of other states. This support encourages Israel's aggressive actions on the occupied Arab lands.

The Israeli delegate's speech boiled down to futile attempts to justify the insolent conduct of occupationists towards educational establishments on the occupied lands, Israel's arrogant stand at international organisations.

The discussion is continuing.

UK Delegate's Remarks

PM041656 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by V. Zakharko under the rubric "On the Day's Topics": "Attacks on UNESCO"]

[Text] Sofia -- The work of the 23d UNESCO General Conference Session is now into its 4th week in the Bulgarian capital. A debate has now gotten under way here within the framework of commissions which are discussing their parts of the program and budget for 1986-1987.

The opinion voiced during the session's work that UNESCO must be preserved predominates among the representatives of the organization's 150 member-states who have gathered in Sofia. It must continue to follow the course of deepening cooperation in spheres of special importance to mankind.

In recent days general attention has been elicited by the debate on the program "Peace, International Mutual Understanding, Human Rights, and the Peoples' Rights." Delegates from more than 60 countries have spoken. The majority of them have pointed out that some of UNESCO's chief tasks today are the search for peace, disarmament, and the liquidation of the threat of nuclear war.

The speech by T. Eggar, British under secretary of state for foreign affairs, who declared that this program serves as grounds "for brainwashing and human thought control," bewildered many delegates and elicited sharp criticism from them. In fact, he cast doubt on any value of a whole number of traditional aspects of UNESCO activity, saying that they "reflect just propaganda slogans."

The delegate from the Netherlands, who spoke next, voiced amazement at the British representative's insulting tone of voice. Many participants in the debate evaluated Eggar's words as ultimatum-like and unacceptable. Evidently feeling that he had gone too far, he spoke a second time, but with "elucidations" to what he had said earlier. Seeking to soften the extremely unfavorable impression produced by his speech, he tried to deny that his intentions had included issuing UNESCO with an ultimatum. But there are no naive people here. All could see the verbal maneuvering of London's high-ranking representative for what it really was: Britain's stand is directed against UNESCO and, through it, also against the United Nations. Speaking of Britain's possible withdrawal from UNESCO, Eggar said that the final decision on this question will be adopted after the conclusion of the Sofia session.

The stands taken here by the representatives of such countries as the FRG, Switzerland, Japan, and a number of others also clearly do not help to overcome the difficulties facing UNESCO. At the same time the session secretariat is continuing to receive from different ends of the world telegrams and messages voicing solidarity with UNESCO's activity.

The Sofia session will last through 12 November. Despite overt and disguised attacks on UNESCO and its course, the overwhelming majority of delegates await the results of the session's work with optimism.

REAGAN INTERVIEW WITH SOVIET JOURNALISTS PUBLISHED

'Text' of Interview

PM041538 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

["Interview With U.S. President" -- IZVESTIYA headline; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The U.S. President has granted an interview in the White House to a group of Soviet journalists comprising G.A. Shishkin, V.V. Ovchinnikov, S.N. Kondrashov, and G.A. Borovik. The President handed over the text of written answers to questions posed in advance; he also had a conversation with the journalists.

The text of the interview with R. Reagan follows below.

Question: For understandable reasons, the meeting shortly between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and yourself, Mr President, is anticipated as a event of special importance. Both sides have stated their intention to make efforts to improve relations between the two countries and to ameliorate [ozdorovleniye] the international atmosphere as a whole. In the past period the Soviet Union has put forward a whole complex of specific proposals and has also taken a number of unilateral steps in the most diverse areas directly aimed at achieving the aforementioned objective. What is the United States going to do for its part?

Answer: I agree entirely that my meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is of special importance; I am looking forward to it with great interest. I sincerely hope we will be able to channel relations between our two countries into a more reliable and safer course. For my part, I will of course do everything in my power to achieve this objective.

Naturally, we study every Soviet proposal carefully, and when we find such proposals encouraging we note this with joy. But, if we find they are one-sided, we explain why we think so. At the same time, we have also put forward specific proposals; we have made dozens of such proposals concerning all aspects of our relations beginning with the elimination of chemical weapons and the settlement of regional conflicts and ending with the expansion of contacts and exchanges.

I will cite a few examples. One of the issues that has created a tremendous strain in U.S.-Soviet relations in recent years is the attempt to solve problems in various parts of the world by means of the use of military force. The use of weapons -- whether in Afghanistan, Cambodia, or Africa -- has produced nothing either for the prospects of achieving peace or for the resolution of the problems of the regions in question, but has merely brought unnecessary suffering to the peoples of these regions. In addition, it is also dangerous. We must find a method of ending attempts to solve problems by means of the use of force. It is for this reason that I have proposed that both our countries encourage the parties to such conflicts to cease the armed struggle and seek a negotiated solution. And, if they show a readiness for this, our countries must be able to reach agreement on how to promote a solution of the problem by peaceful means and also on refraining from granting military support to the warring sides. If it is possible to achieve peace, the United States will make a generous contribution to international efforts to restore the war-ravaged national economies, just as we did after World War II, when we helped friends and former foes equally; just as we have done in innumerable other cases.

The governments of our two countries agree that our nuclear arsenals are too great. Both governments are in favor of radical weapons reductions.

Therefore, the United States has made specific proposals to this end: reducing the number of ballistic missile warheads to 5,000 on each side and also totally eliminating the entire category of medium-range missiles from our arsenals. These were not "all or nothing" proposals. We are prepared to negotiate because we know that negotiations are necessary in order to reach a solution whereby neither side will feel threatened. We are prepared to renounce our superiority in certain areas if you, for your part, are prepared to do likewise. It is important to embark on reducing these terrible weapons in such a way that both sides feel secure and to continue this process until we have destroyed these weapons completely.

The events of the last 10 or 15 years have considerably increased mistrust between our countries. In order to resolve the key questions of our relations, something must be done to restore mutual trust. This requires the expansion of communication and contacts, and also close attention to ensuring both sides fulfill the agreements that have been reached. It is for this reason we have submitted literally between 40 and 50 proposals aimed at improving our working relationship, expanding links, and strengthening trust. For instance, we have proposed concluding an agreement on cooperation in the peaceful utilization of space. The joint Apollo-Soyuz spaceflight was carried out with tremendous success in 1975; we must try to resume cooperation of this sort. We have also submitted a number of proposals on establishing more direct contacts [boleye pryamykh kontaktov] between our military. If they got together a little more, they might find that at least some of their fears are unjustified. But, the main thing is that ordinary people from the two countries ought to get together more, especially our young people. After all, the future belongs to them! I would like thousands of students to travel each year from the United States to the USSR and vice versa in order to learn from one another and, most importantly, to learn to understand that, notwithstanding the difference between our world outlooks, we can and must live in peace.

Of course, we will not resolve all our disagreements at a single meeting. But, we want to take specific steps forward. The main thing is that I hope our meeting will provide the impetus for beginning a real process of probelm-solving and that we will be able to reach agreement on what kind of course will bring us to a safer world for everyone and to growing cooperation between our countries.

Question: The Soviet Union advocates peaceful coexistence with states belonging to the other social system, the United States included. A number of your speeches have pursued the idea that military conflict must be prevented, despite the differences between our countries. In other words, we must learn to live in peace. Thus, both sides recognize that questions of arms limitation and reduction are and will be crucial in their relations. The special responsibility borne by the USSR and the United States for the fate of peace is an objective fact. What do you believe can be achieved in the security sphere at your meeting with M.S. Gorbachev?

Answer: First of all, I would say that all countries must live in peace regardless of whether they have the same different social systems. Even if the social systems are similar, this does not give a country the right to use force against another. But, you are quite right to say we must learn to live in peace. I have said many times that nuclear war cannot be won and it must be prevented. This means there must be no war between our countries. You are also right to say our countries bear a special responsibility to peace -- not only because we have huge nuclear arsenals, but also because we are great powers and, whether we like it or not, our example and actions also influence everyone around us.

Questions of our relations include not only the reaching of new agreements, but also the observance of old ones. Your country often accuses us of interfering in your internal affairs on issues such as human rights, but that is precisely a good example. Ten years ago our countries became parties to the Helsinki agreements and assumed commitments to act according to certain norms. We observe these commitments and we expect this of others too.

Soviet-U.S. relations exert an influence on regional conflicts, on political relations between our friends and allies, and on a great deal else.

The fact that our countries possess the biggest nuclear arsenals with the greatest destructive might obliges us to ensure they are never used and that we lead the world toward the elimination of these terrible weapons.

I think our meeting with General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev may be the start of progress toward the goals our countries have set themselves: sharply reducing nuclear arms and taking measures aimed at completely eliminating them. We can do this by finding specific ways of surmounting obstacles in the process of the [summit] talks, thereby giving a substantial fillip to our representatives at the [arms]talks. Of course, we will also have to resolve other questions, because it will be very difficult to secure substantial shifts on the question of arms limitation unless we simultaneously take measures to lessen tension, to reduce the use of force and the threat of its use, and also to strengthen faith in our ability to maintain constructive relations.

Question: As is well known, in Geneva in January the USSR and the United States agreed that a primary aim [perveyshaya tsel] of their new talks should be the prevention of an arms race in space. Yet, now the U.S. delegation at the talks is trying to reduce matters to a discussion merely of the question of nuclear arms and is refusing to speak of preventing an arms race in space. How is this U.S. position to be understood?

Answer: Your account of the essence of the January accord is incorrect. In fact, our countries' foreign ministers agreed that the "aim of the talks will be the formulation of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability." They went on to agree that the "subject of the talks will be the complex of issues concerning space and nuclear arms -- both strategic and medium-range -- and all these issues will be examined and resolved in their interrelationship."

Since your question shows a misunderstanding of the U.S. stance, allow me to clarify it for you.

In the first place, we believe that nuclear weapons of mass destruction are the most threatening weapons for mankind today. They are offensive weapons and they exist today, in very large numbers. Thus, our paramount task is to start radically reducing them, creating conditions for their ultimate elimination in the future. Since a large proportion of missiles must pass through space to reach their targets, the reduction of this type of weapon is no less important for the prevention of an arms race in space than for the termination of the arms race on earth.

As I have already noted, we have submitted specific, definite proposals for this purpose. Your government recently put forward counterproposals, we will respond to them in the spirit of a true desire to meet the Soviet side halfway in order to enable us to move forward in the quest for practical solutions acceptable to both countries.

Second, we believe that offensive and defensive means are closely interconnected and that these questions must be examined, as our foreign ministers agreed, in their interrelationship. Our proposals accord fully with this view. At present, we are trying to begin a detailed discussion with the Soviet representatives in Geneva about how to achieve equilibrium between offensive and defensive means. If scientists succeed in developing [razrabotat] effective means of defense in the future, then both our countries could use them to defend themselves and their allies without threatening one another. If we finally manage to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons, the countries will need to have a defense against such weapons in case they fall into the hands of some madman who would decide to use them for blackmail.

Specifically, we have submitted the following proposals: on strategic nuclear weapons -- reduction of each side's nuclear arsenals to 5,000 warheads on ballistic missiles. This will mean an enormous reduction in the level of arms, which will help to considerably strengthen strategic stability. We have also proposed that agreement be reached on strict limitations of other types of weapons. Since the structure of our armed forces is different and since the Soviet side has objected that it would have to restructure its forces, we have proposed seeking mutual solutions which will make it possible to balance forces in light of these differences in individual fields of U.S. and Soviet military might.

On medium-range nuclear forces, we believe the best thing is to altogether eliminate the entire category of arms, which includes the SS-20 type missiles (441 missiles) deployed by the Soviet Union and our Pershing-2 missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles. If this proves unacceptable at this time, we have also proposed a draft interim agreement envisaging an equal number of warheads for U.S. and Soviet missiles in this category; at the lowest possible quantitative level.

On the questions of space and defense, we propose to discuss possibilities with Soviet representatives which may help the creation [sozdaniye] of new technology for a gradual transition by each side toward increasing reliance on defensive systems, rather than basing its security on offensive nuclear weapons.

Frankly speaking, I find it difficult to understand why some people misunderstand or misinterpret our position. Research concerning strategic defense in the United States is conducted in precisely the same areas as similar research in the Soviet Union. There are only two differences: First, the Soviet Union has been working in many of these areas longer than we have and it is ahead of us in some of them. Second, we speak openly about our program because our political system demands open debate before decisions on such issues are made. But, these differences of approach to political decisionmaking must not lead to erroneous conclusions. Both sides are engaged in similar research work; there is nothing wrong in this.

But in this line, we find it somewhat difficult to understand why we are accused of all kinds of aggressive intentions when we are doing only what you are doing. Here, it is important for us to be able to discuss these questions frankly with you.

Generally speaking, we are striving to attain a balanced, fair, and verifiable agreement or series of agreements which will enable us to do what we agreed in Geneva in January; namely, to end the arms race on earth and prevent it in space. The United States has no dirty tricks, just as we have not the slightest desire to threaten the Soviet Union. Frankly speaking, if the Soviet Union were to take a similar stance, we could start advancing very rapidly toward an agreement.

Question: Mr President, representatives of your administration claim the United States sides with the forces of democracy in international relations. How is it possible to reconcile the United States' practical actions with such statements? After all, if any example from the present day is taken, it will turn out that whenever the people of any country want to exercise their right to independent free development -- be it in the Near East, southern Africa, Central America, or Asia -- it is the United States which supports those who oppose the majority of the people and the legitimate governments.

Answer: Your claims regarding U.S. actions are totally groundless. Your question is formulated as though the United States were waging war in some other country and thus acting against the will of a majority of the people desiring self-determination. I can assure you this does not correspond with reality. I, like all Americans, am proud of the fact that not a single U.S. soldier is fighting anywhere on the globe.

If every state could make such a statement, then tension and the feeling of danger in the world would be reduced considerably.

Yes, we are totally in favor of democracy. Democracy is the basis of our political system and our world outlook. Our state, unlike many other states, was not founded on the basis of a single nationality or a single national culture; it was founded on the basis of democratic ideals. We believe, for example, that a government is legitimate only when it is created by the people; we also believe the government must be subordinated to the people, who elect those who are to govern them by means of free elections. But, the concept of democracy is considerably broader than the question of elections in which all those who wish to do so can participate. We believe there are actions which even a legitimately elected government is not entitled to take. No U.S. Government has the right to restrict freedom of speech or of religion, and no U.S. Government has the right to prescribe to people where they ought to live and whether or not they can leave the country. These and the other personal freedoms enshrined in our Constitution represent the most precious legacy left by our forefathers; we are prepared to defend it to the very end, for as long as we exist as a state.

But, this does not mean we consider ourselves beyond reproach in everything. Of course not. For over 200 years we have tried to live in accordance with the ideals for which we strive and to rectify shortcomings in our society; we are working on this even now. Nor does this mean we consider ourselves entitled to impose our system on others. We do not think this because we believe that every people have the right to freely choose their way of life. But when we see that other peoples are threatened by external forces which may destroy their freedom and impose minority rule on them with the help of arms, we help them to resist this wherever we can.

We use force only as the last resort -- only when either our allies or we ourselves become the victims of aggression. Thus, we participated totally and energetically in World War II, the successful war against Hitlerism, although the fascists did not invade our country. We have not forgotten our wartime alliance, and we have not forgotten the heroic resistance offered by the Soviet people in this struggle. Nor have we forgotten the fact that we never took advantage of our position as one of the victors to annex new territories to our state or to dominate others. On the contrary, we gave aid for the restoration of the devastated countries of both friends and former enemies and helped establish democracy for those who were previously under the yoke of totalitarianism. Have we not all gained from the fact that Japan and the FRG today are flourishing democratic countries belonging to a lasting and humane world order? Of course, the main credit is due to the Japanese and German peoples, but we do believe we have helped them in this.

The development of events and trends in the areas you named encourages us, although there are still many regions causing alarm. In Southern Africa, Angola is rent by civil war: We have decided to supply weapons to neither side and to press for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. In the Republic of South Africa, the apartheid system disgusts all Americans. However, here too we seek a peaceful settlement: For many years now we have refused to supply the South African Government with weapons or equipment for the police. The Latin American countries have achieved great successes in switching from totalitarian regimes to democracy: There are only four states left there whose governments are not freely elected. Since 1979, the Latin American countries have taken a colossal step toward the democratization of the continent. For many years we have played a leading role in the cause of decolonization and we try to use our influence on our closest friends and allies to accelerate that process. We feel satisfaction at the fact that the decolonization process is almost complete and we are proud of our role in this. I must stress that our goal is to promote the democratization process by peaceful means. And not only the U.S. Government, but the U.S. people support this process by their actions and deeds.

U.S. society has long been typified by a spirit of voluntary activity and compassion toward the less fortunate. We are proud in our country of our activity in supporting those who cannot support themselves. Through a whole string of voluntary organizations not only the U.S. Government, but also the U.S. people help the needy -- flood and fire victims, the old, the sick, and those in difficulties. Americans are no less generous in helping other peoples. I remember Herbert Hoover's efforts to organize U.S. aid for the starving in the Soviet Union in the twenties. That help continues to this day, be it food for the starving in Ethiopia or for the victims of the earthquake in Mexico.

Question: The Soviet Union has unilaterally taken a whole series of major steps: It has adopted a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, declared a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, ceased the deployment of medium-range missiles in its European territory, and even reduced their numbers. Why has the United States done nothing similar?

Answer: Actually, we have repeatedly taken measures to reduce tension and shown our good will.

Not only did we not use our nuclear monopoly against others, we showed our peaceful intentions by demobilizing our armed forces unsually quickly.

The United States and the NATO countries have repeatedly stressed in their statements that we will never use our weapons -- either conventional or nuclear -- unless we are attacked.

Allow me to add a fact which, perhaps, is little known in the Soviet Union. By agreement with the NATO countries, the United States has already removed more than 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe since 1979. When this operation is fully completed, more than 2,400 nuclear warheads will have been removed in all. That means we are eliminating more than five nuclear shells [snaryady] for each medium-range missile we intend to install. As a result, the numerical strength of our nuclear forces in Europe will be the lowest for roughly 20 years.

Currently, the Soviet Union has deployed 441 SS-20 missiles with 3 warheads each, making 1,323 warheads all told. I don't need to remind you that the Soviet side started deployment when NATO had no similar means in Europe. At first we tried to eliminate these means through negotiations, but when we failed to reach agreement NATO embarked on a limited retailiatory deployment, which is gradually being carried out. Today the Soviet Union has a seven-to-one advantage in warheads on already deployed missiles. Our position remains the same as it has always been: It would be best to agree on the complete elimination of these types of missiles. But even if we are disappointed in our hopes of reaching agreement and NATO is forced to embark on full deployment, that will only amount to no more than 572 missiles, each with 1 warhead.

Moreover, President Carter abandoned production both of enhanced radiation warheads and of B-1 bombers. The Soviet Union took no measures in response. In 1977 and 1978, the United States also tried to start talks on banning the development [razrabotka] of antisatellite weapons. The Soviet Union rejected such a ban and engaged in developing [razarabotka] and testing an antisatellite system. Now that the Soviet Union has already created an operational antisatellite system, it is now proposing that a "freeze" be introduced before the United States has time to test its own system.

The questions concerning our two countries are so important that the peoples of both of them must be accurately informed of our governments' positions. Moreover, each country's mass media have an important role to play. We must not try to "score points" off the other side, and the media, for their part, must not distort our respective positions.

It is important for each side to approach the other side's proposals seriously and to make sincere efforts to overcome the things that divide us so as to serve the interests of our two countries and the entire world. It is in this spirit that I am preparing for the meeting with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev.

R. Reagan went on to answer the journalists' spoken questions.

Question: Mr President, we have familiarized ourselves with your written replies. You set out old U.S. proposals in them. They have already been examined by the Soviet side and assessed as unbalanced and as giving advantages to the United States. You have not said what the U.S. reply is to the new Soviet proposals. Yet, it is precisely this question that primarily interests people before Geneva.

Answer: In Geneva our delegation at the talks will give our reply, which will reflect the thrust of our original proposal. It will show that we accept certain of the numerical indicators contained in the general secretary's proposals.

Question: According to the figures of the latest opinion poll carried out by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC TV, Americans stated by 74 percent to 20 percent that they would prefer a reduction in the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals, not the creation of space arms by the United States. That, judging by the poll, is the choice the U.S. people are making. In these circumstances, what will be your response, Mr President, to the choice made by the U.S. public?

Answer: There is a misunderstanding here, the term "star wars" was coined by a U.S. politican and has spread everywhere. We do not speak of "star wars" at all. We speak of a quest for defensive weapons which do not kill people, but prevent nuclear missiles from reaching their target after they are launched from their silos -- making it possible to intercept these weapons systems. When inaccurate terms are used people get the wrong idea. A public opinion poll was held recently and our people were asked about their attitude to "star wars," and only 30 percent approved of it -- approximately the same as in the case you have mentioned. But, when the question was formulated differently -- how do they view our research to create a "strategic defensive shield" -- over 90 percent of those polled advocated continuing the program.

Question: In the present situation in the international arena attempts to create the "space shield" which you have mentioned will inevitably lead to the suspicion that the country creating the "shield" in fact wants to acquire the capability for a first nuclear strike. Many people agree with that truth. And Americans have expressed their opinion by pointing out that if things come down to a choice between the creation of such a space system and nuclear arms reductions, they prefer nuclear arms reductions. That assessment by the U.S. public seems realistic. I would like to ask how the U.S. Government will react to this opinion of the U.S. people's?

Answer: Yes, of course, if anyone created such a defensive system in combination with nuclear offensive arms then, yes, he would be more tempted to venture to inflict a first strike. But your country started work on this kind of plan years before us and so, I think it is we who ought to have certain suspicions that you yourselves want to achieve this.

But I have said it before and I am ready to say it again at the summit, if these weapons become possible and if our research shows this, we will say to the entire world: "There they are, be our guest!" We will not deploy these defensive weapons until we have gotten rid of our nuclear missiles, our offensive missiles. And we will make them available to other countries, including the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet Union and the United States state that they will destroy their offensive arms, we will deploy these defensive weapons in case some madman somewhere in the world tries to create nuclear offensive arms again. And we will all be at peace if we know that when some madman somewhere tries to do this, we will all be able to defend ourselves against him. So I assure you now that we will not try to monopolize defensive weapons with a view to gaining a first-strike capability.

Question: I should like to ask you a question about some problems concerning mutual suspicion and distrust. You recently said at the UN General Assembly that the United States does not occupy other people's land. Yet nearly 550,000 U.S. servicemen are stationed outside the United States. Some 1,500 U.S. military bases have been created in 32 countries. A map designating them shows graphically who is encircling whom and consequently who is threatening whom. You admit the USSR is right to be concerned for its security. Soviet people cannot fail to be alarmed by the chain of bases which has closed around them. Our country has nothing like that. Under these conditions, how can we move to the "balance of security" you are talking about?

Answer: I cannot reply to the specific figures you have cited. I cannot remember them offhand, but having bases abroad is one thing and occuping a country -- which is what the Soviet Union is doing in Afghanistan and also in other places, in Angola, South Yemen, and Ethiopia -- is another.

Yes, we keep troops at bases. A considerable proportion of them are part of the NATO forces. As a member of that alliance the United States sends its troops to make up the NATO forces. The same situation also exists in Korea, where we have troops at the South Korean Government's request to render it assistance, because there is a demilitarized zone and a threat from North Korea. We also have bases elsewhere; in particular, in the Pacific. We have rented bases for many years from the Philippines. We even have a naval base which we rented in Cuba long before F. Castro came to power, but in my opinion that is a long way from occupying other countries.

Question: If the Cuban people were to hold a referendum and to decide the U.S. troops should leave the base in Guantanamo, would your soldiers be evacuated?

Answer: No. Because the rental agreement was concluded many years ago and will not expire for many years yet; we have legal grounds for being there. The base is fenced in. It does not maintain any contacts with the people or the main island of Cuba.

Question: Since you mentioned Afghanistan, Mr President, we would like to state clearly that the Soviet limited military contingent is there at the request of the Afghan Government to render it assistance in defending its country from attack by the military formations sent there from outside with U.S. assistance and money.

Mr President, you said the United States has never sought to impose its will by force, but is promoting the process of the establishment of democracy "by peaceful means." However, how can this be reconciled with the long list of instances of the use of military force by the United States; beginning with, for instance, Vietnam, on which 7 million tons of bombs were dropped, and ending with Grenada?

Answer: There are no warring forces in Afghanistan sent there from outside. But the things that are happening there, if more people knew about it, would shock the whole world. For instance, one of the types of weapons used against the Afghan people consists of toys, dolls, toy trucks, things which attract children. They are dropped from the air, children pick them up, they explode, and blow off their hands. We call them "minitraps." This scarcely accords with the methods of warfare between states.

As for Vietnam, or it would be better to say French Indochina, when it ceased to be a colony, the Geneva conference created North and South Vietnam. In North Vietnam there was a government which had been in existence since the Japanese occupation of French Indochina. But South Vietnam still had to create a government. We were invited to help them by providing instructors in creating what they had never had before -- armed forces. Our instructors went there in civilian clothing. Their families went with them. And they began, in a country where there had never been any military schools or anything like that, to create armed forces for the South Vietnamese Government.

From the outset they were persecuted by terrorists. Ultimately, they had to send their families home. Bombs exploded in the schools. The practice even existed there of placing bombs in movie theater gangways, causing the deaths of untold numbers of people who had simply come to watch a movie. Finally, changes were made which enabled our people to arm themselves for their own self-defense. President Kennedy sent in sub-units; this grew into the war in Vietnam.

We never tried to win a victory. Perhaps that was precisely where we made a mistake. We simply tried to preserve the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. We now know how that ended. Now there is a singly state -- Vietnam. It was won in contravention of the treaty signed in Paris.

I've been talking so long, I forgot what else you were asking about.

Question: About Grenada.

Answer: Ah, Grenada! There were several hundred U.S. medical students there and our intelligence discovered they might be taken hostage. The Grenadian Government asked for military aid. Not only from the United States, but also from the Commonwealth [Sodruzhestvo] states -- Jamaica, Dominica, and a number of others. In turn, they redirected this request to us, because their own armed forces were not enough.

So we landed. And we found stocks of Soviet-produced weapons there. And hundreds of Cubans. Everything was done very quickly. Our troops liberated the island, saved the students, and went home very quickly. Democracy was established in Grenada.

Question: Mr President, in 1972 the United States and the Soviet Union signed the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems at summit level, which says absolutely clearly: "Each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based," But some representatives of your administration now claim this treaty authorizes the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based ABM weapons. This arbitrary interpretation can scarcely promote agreement. What is the U.S. Administration's real position with regard to the ABM Treaty? Does it intend to observe it or not?

Answer: There are two different interpretations of the treaty. The treaty has an additional article which seems more liberal than Article V. On the other hand, we have clearly shown we intend to keep within the limits of the strict definition of the treaty. As for research -- and that would also include tests -- that accords with the treaty.

As I have already said, what we are doing now complies with the treaty and is what the Soviet Union has been doing for some time, carrying out the same kind of research. But when matters reach the point of deployment, I don't know what the Soviet Union intends to do and when and if its research leads to the creation [sozdaniye] of such weapons. But I do know what we intend to do and I have already talked about it.

You may object now that if we intend to eliminate nuclear armaments, why do we need defense? Well, I will repeat what I said earlier. We all know how to produce nuclear weapons and there is a possibility that a madman might appear in the world sometime; after all, our two countries were allies in a war which did in fact break out because of such a madman. That is why it would be something like what happened in Geneva after World War I, when the states decided to ban poison gases, but we all kept gas masks. So these weapons, if they could be created, would be today's gas mask. But, we want everyone to have them and the elimination of offensive weapons would be a condition of their acquistion and a condition of our own deployment of these weapons.

So we will never violate this treaty.

Question: Unfortunately, Mr President, we have no opportunity to debate these questions with you, although we have different viewpoints.

Answer: Well, never mind.

Question: I should like to ask you to explain an interesting phenomenon. In 1979 after 7 years of the most painstaking work, the SALT II treaty was concluded between the USSR and the United States. It enshrined military-strategic parity between our countries. This was confirmed by President Carter, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the most eminent U.S. military specialists. But, when you became President you suddenly announced that the USSR had long since overtaken the United States in the military field. You have been repeating this for 5 years now. As recently as 17 September you said it again. But this year the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff reaffirmed that military-strategic parity exists between our countries. How is this strange contradiction to be explained?

Answer: In reality there is no contradiction. Some people speak of parity in the sense that we have an adequate deterrent potential, in other words we have sufficient opportunities for making trouble for anyone who attacks us. But no, your aresenal is greatly superior to ours.

I realize I have not answered many of your questions. I guess I have been slow and thus deprived you of the opportunity to ask other questions. I know you still have many questions and I regret we have no time for them. But I would like to say that the Soviet Union and the United States, or to be more precise Russia and the United States have been allies in one of these wars -- the last and biggest, World War II. Americans and Russians died next to each other, fighting a common enemy. Americans are also buried on Soviet soil. I want to say to the General Secretary: Wars are initiated by governments, not by peoples. I have a sheet of paper on which I recently wrote down some words from an article and there is a very great deal of truth in them: "Peoples do not distrust each other because they are armed. They arm themselves because they do not trust each other." I hope that during our summit meeting we will be able to find ways of proving by deeds and not just by words that we have no need not to trust each other. And that we will be able to stop burdening our peoples by increasing armaments instead of creating increasing prosperity for ther

Journalists' Report

PM041930 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Report from Washington by G. Shishkin, V. Ovchinnikov, S. Kondrashov, and G. Borovik entitled: "Apropos of R. Reagan's Interview"]

[Text] We four Soviet journalists arrived in Washington by air to interview U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The interview was arranged on the proposal of the U.S. side.

... 1400 sharp the door of the President's Oval Office opened. We saw the U.S. President standing there brightly lit by television floodlights. He courteously welcomed the Soviet journalists. Apart from television reporters and photographers, who were let in for a few minutes, there were some fifteen presidential aids in the office, including his chief aid, -- Donald Regan, White House chief of staff; Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary; and Patrick Buchanan, adviser on propaganda, known for his ultraconservative views. They did not meddle in the course of the interview, yet they were not just curious onlookers.

President Reagan is reported to have prepared for this interview, and, correspondingly, for the opportunity to appear in the Soviet press, no less carefully than he did for the television debate with Walter Mondale, his rival in last year's presidential elections.

It does not matter too much whether it was so or not. Another thing is important. People here in Washington and in the United States are looking forward with growing interest and hope to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. The less time there is to go before Geneva, the stronger the expectation of positive practical results at the talks between the leaders of the two great powers.

The more so because the latest meeting of this kind took place more than six years ago and since then Soviet-U.S. relations have sharply deteriorated; in the first place because of the tough, confrontational policy of the Reagan administration, which has from the very first days purposefully sought to dismantle the peaceful edifice of detente and started implementing the gigantic buildup of the U.S. Armed Forces, having spent a trillion dollars on it in the course of four years.

Like all people, Americans are asking: What are the participants in the summit meeting going there with? The answer from the Soviet side is clear, an answer inspiring justified hope. As a matter of practically contributing to a favorable outcome of the Geneva meeting, the Soviet Union has taken unilateral steps and put forward a package of constructive measures whose implementation oculd lead to a breakthrough in the development of international relations. These proposals, set forth by Mikhail S. Gorbachev, in his speech to french parliamentarians, are well known. Their thrust is to bar the way to a further arms race, prevent it in outer space, while very radically reducing nuclear arms stockpiles.

The Soviet initiatives have made a powerful impact on the international political climate. The general opinion, which is also popular in the Western press, is that Moscow has taken over the initiative in the political-psychological preparations conducted by both sides in the period before the Geneva meeting. The Soviet arguments and the Soviet practical actions have exerted such influence that Western politicians can no longer ignore them. Even here, in the United States where the mass media's deep-rooted anti-Sovietism cannot but influence the common American, public opinion polls show the attitude to Soviet policy and to the Soviet leadership's actions is changing, and changing in a fairly substantial manner.

This fact has caused open concern, if not alarm, in the U.S. Administration.

The matter at stake is its domestic and international reputation, Washington's image in the eyes of its own and other peoples. The matter at stake is trust in and support of the policy of the White House on the part of its European and other allies. The tactics of naysaying and hushing up Soviet proposals can hardly persuade anybody any longer, while the tough propaganda rhetoric of administration spokesmen has plainly come to bore people. The whole community is waiting for practical actions rather than words.

That is the dilemma U.S. foreign policy has found itself in. It is against this backdrop, in these conditions that rush efforts are being made in Washington to improve the "image" of U.S. policy -- and of the U.S. president -- before the meeting in Geneva. This also constitutes, as a matter of fact, the entire rationale behind Ronald Reagan's interview to members of the Soviet press.

So the U.S. President has expressed a desire to speak to the Soviet people through the Soviet press. IZVESTIYA has granted him this opportunity. Having answered the five questions we had forwarded to him in advance, the President, alas, alloted us only 30 minutes for a conversation and we were not able to ask him even a third of our questions concerning U.S. policy. As far as the content of the President's replies is concerned, they hold in effect nothing new for those who have even the slightest knowledge of the political world outlook and, of course, practical political actions of Ronald Reagan. His answers distinctly show a vision of the world through the eyes of a U.S. conservative who is prepared to forget or not to notice obvious facts that are known to all, if they fail to correspond to his views -- or expose the nature of his activities. Stereotypes are corrosive [vevshiyesya, kak rzha] and prevent our seeing the world the way it is.

Let us note at first, however, the assurances of the U.S. leadership's good intentions which will be duly appreciated in our country if they are matched by practical actions within the next few weeks. The general words about the forthcoming meeting in Geneva sound sensible. The reader can return to them himself.

In the interview, the U.S. President readily repeated the words which he stinted so niggardly during his first months and years in the White House: "...We must learn to live in peace.... A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought: And this means that our countries must not fight any type of war." The Soviet people, just like the Americans and like all other nations, are of course prepared to welcome the hope, voiced by the President: that his meeting with the Soviet leader "can start us on the road toward the goal our countries have set: the radical reduction of nuclear weapons and steps to achieve their complete elimination."

But, however good general words sound, their true worth can only be known from specific actions and facts, from real manifestations and directions of policy. So let us first speak of arbitrary use of facts. The President says his administration has made dozens of concrete proposals to the Soviet Union which "cover every aspect of our relationship," but he sidesteps the fact that with his coming to the White House the U.S. Administration suspended Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms for more than a year. It unilaterally terminated the operation of a number of agreements.

The President makes propaganda in his interview for U.S. proposals declined by the Soviet Union since they are one-sided in character and give unilateral advantages to the nuclear forces of his country, while providing for undercutting the most important component of the strategic forces of the USSR. He recalls with praise his "zero option" concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, but does not specify that if it is carried out, the Soviet Union would indeed be left with a zero, while the Americans would be left with their nuclear-capable medium-range aircraft, including carrier-borne aircraft, and, besides, the nuclear weapons of Britain and France, which are also trained on Soviet territory.

President Reagan speaks about the U.S. proposal to reduce the number of warheads on ballistic missiles (ICBM's and SLBM's) down to 5,000 on each side. On the face of it, it may seem this is an equal number. But, there is no equality here. In fact, this proposal is a way toward a U.S. military advantage. The U.S. approach leaves the course open toward a buildup of combat charges [boyezaryady] on long-range cruise missiles. The U.S. side is trying to place cruise missiles outside the framework of negotiations and reductions. It is evading the Soviet proposal for a ban on such missiles, declaring in general form that the United States is prepared to limit somewhat only air-based cruise missiles. On the whole, the U.S. stand provides not for a reduction, but for a buildup of nuclear charges [zaryady], almost up to 18,000.

Reagan states 2,400 nuclear combat charges will be withdrawn from Europe. Yet, in actual fact, there will be no reduction of the U.S. nuclear weapons stocks in Europe. Instead of the obsolete nuclear warheads (for the "Sergeant" and "Honest John" missiles, which have been phased out) and old airbombs, the Americans have already delivered to Europe 960 nuclear warheads for "Lance" missiles and 200 new airbombs with a switchable TNT equivalent. The United States is to bring to Europe 900 warheads for the "Pershing" missiles; 500 combat charges for land-based long-range cruise missiles; 300 neutron warheads for the "Lance" missiles; 2,200 neutron artillery shells for 203.2 mm and 155 mm howitzers; and up to 3,000 MK61 airbombs, which is a total of nearly 7,000 new nuclear munitions.

Thus, Europe, far from being freed from, is, on the contrary, being increasingly crammed with U.S. nuclear weapons.

In an attempt to prove "Soviet nuclear superiority," the U.S. President takes an overstated number (441 units, 1,323 warheads) of Soviet SS-20 missiles, which are deployed, for that matter, not only in the European zone, but also in the Asian part of the USSR, and compares it only with the number of U.S. missiles deployed in Europe (209 units). In this equation they disregard the nuclear missiles of Britain and France (178 missiles with 530 warheads on them), which are a component part of NATO's nuclear potential.

The real balance of medium-range missiles in Europe is as follows:

The NATO member-countries have a total of 387 missiles with 739 warheads on them. If we take into account the new Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone, their number now is 243, the total number of warheads on them being 729. Thus, there is a rough balance as regards the medium-range missiles.

Taking into account the air force in Europe, NATO has even more medium-range delivery vehicles (1,015 to 850) and nuclear charges on them (roughly 3,000 to 2,000) than the Warsaw Pact.

The balance of the strategic nuclear forces of the USSR and the United States, was checked many times in the course of seven years in the process of drawing up the SALT-II treaty and officially placed on record in 1979 in signing that treaty. At present, the number of strategic delivery vehicles of the sides has not changed as compared with 1979. The USSR has a somewhat larger number of them than the United States (2,504 to 2,215), but the United States has, as before, a far larger number of combat charges on them due to the equiping of hundreds of heavy bombers with long-range cruise missiles. Yet, on the whole there is a rough balance.

Such a conclusion was also drawn by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff in a report to Congress in 1984: "Nowadays there is a rough nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union." As R. O'Neill, director of the International Strategic Research Institute, just told a press conference in London on the occasion of the publication of the Institute's annual report, there is at present a "rough balance" in strategic arms between the USSR and the United States.

In this connection, along with pronouncements in favor of peace, Reagan's remarks strike by the figures game. This is not so innocent an undertaking since policy is based on it, and the continued numbers juggling is fraught with uneasy and even unpredictable times. Such a departure from reality cannot, naturally, but give rise to concern.

All these facts have long been known and explained in great detail more than once, and they in the White House greatly underestimate the political grounding of the Soviet people, if they believe that this way they will "discover America" -- and the U.S. position.

Reagan was deliberately trying to distort the fact when saying "the Soviet Union has at present 441 SS-20 missiles deployed with three warheads on each of them, which makes a total of 1 323 warheads." Such claims are aimed at deliberately distorting the state of things.

In this connection, the USSR Defense Ministry has officially said: "The number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone is 243, and on the whole of the USSR's territory the number of SS-20 missiles is considerably smaller than the number of 441 given by NATO." So Reagan's formula about a "seven-fold" Soviet "superiority" is a false, falsified equation.

We would like to especially touch upon the U.S. plans to militarize outer space and how they are presented in R. Reagan's interview. These plans, which have been actively and perseveringly implemented after the U.S. President put forward his "Strategic Defense Initiative" in March 1983, have become the main stumbling block in the way towards improving Soviet-U.S. relations and the whole international atmosphere. This stumbling block can be neither passed over nor disregarded. There is only one way to remove it -- by preventing an arms race in outer space.

Without the resolution of this key issue, the President's words about starting to move on the road toward "the radical reduction of nuclear weapons" will only be good, but deceptive wishing. And the reality will be an uncontrolled process of an even more intensive arms race, its extension into the next century -- into the next millennium -- further enormous military spending, which is a burden on our peoples, and a serious growth of the nuclear threat.

Americans realize the danger carried by the "Strategic Defense Initiative," despite the incessant drum-beating for this pet idea of the President. A recent public opinion poll taken by the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST and the ABC television network has shown that the Americans prefer by a majority of 74 percent against 20 percent a reduction of the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR to the U.S. development of space weapons.

This realistic choice of the U.S. people is consonant with the Soviet stand as spelled out by Mikhail Gorbachev in his replies to the U.S. magazine TIME: "We call on the United States seriously to reach agreement with us on strategic nuclear arms, on medium-range arms, and on problems of outer space."

But what most of the common Americans understand, the U.S. President is unwilling to understand, refuses to understand. Yet, claims are being made that decision-making in the United States is done in a democratic spirit, by asking the prior consent of the people. But the White House did not ask the opinion of the Americans when drawing the country into the bloody adventure in Southeast Asia for many years or when preparing to use the raw force of Marines against tiny Grenada. When we asked the President a question backed up by the findings of the above-mentioned public opinion survey conducted by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC, he evaded an answer.

Instead, he began lauding the "defensive character" of the planned space weapons, albeit he was forced to admit actually that the "space shield", which is being created along with nuclear offensive weapons by one of the sides, increases the suspicion of another side as regards the possibility of launching the first nuclear strike under cover of such a shield.

At the end of the interview, the President took out of his pocket a card specially prepared by him and read a favorite quotation: "Nations do not distrust each other because they are armed. They arm themselves because they distrust each other." At the same time, if one takes his word on trust, he believes that in this complex, contradictory, conflicting, and distrustful world, the other side will believe his promises of sharing one of the top U.S. technological secrets involved in the creation of the "space shield", under whose cover the United States will sharpen its nuclear sword. This is highly unconvincing "idealism" when expressed by an advocate of the positions of strength policy, who, in addition, is known for his anti-Soviet convictions, which he does not even conceal, but publicizes and gets pleasure out of.

One cannot but doubt the President's promises to make the "strategic defense" technology "available to other countries, including the Soviet Union," while even the allies of the United States -- which Washington proposed join in the implementation of its program -- complain that the United States does not intend to give them access to its technological secrets and that the U.S. Administration has a different aim of starting, to use the current expression, "a brain drain", thus saving U.S. resources and accelerating implementation of the SDI program as much as possible.

How can one rely on the assurances given by the White House, while only a few weeks ago the Pentagon and the CIA issued with much pomp a report accusing, without any sound reason, the Soviet Union of attempts at "stealing U.S. technology" and demanding even a further toughening of measures to prevent a "leakage of secrets to the Fast".

In answer to the question whether the U.S. Administration was going to observe Article 5 of the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Defense Systems saying that each side will not develop, test, or deploy antiballistic missile components or systems which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based, Reagan was forced to admit that there are varying" interpretations" of the treaty among his administration. He said the United States intended to abide strictly by the terms of the treaty.

Nevertheless, the President insisted in his reply that "what we are doing with regard to research -- and that would include testing -- is within the treaty."

But here is a remark by Gerard Smith, who led the U.S. delegation to the talks on the limitation of strategic armaments that were marked, specifically, by the signing of the ABM Treaty and who is justly considered a major authority on the subject:" The current debates in the administration on the 'interpretation' of the ABM Treaty cannot be described as anything but absurd. There can be no doubt that the treaty bans the testing and deployment of space-based ABM systems. The language of the treaty, especially its Clause Five, is utterly clear."

In our view, the conversation with the President confirmed yet another time that the ABM Treaty is becoming an obstacle in the way of the Washington administration's implementation of the "star wars" plans. In a bid to pave the way for the militarization of outer space, the United States is prepared, as Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, director of the SDI organization, bluntly declared casting aside verbal subtleties, to depart at some moment from the ABM Treaty.

The ABM Treaty is not the only one to be affected in case of the realization of SDI.

Reflecting the concern of broad sections of the U.S. public, well-known physicist Carl Sagan wrote in the DISCOVER magazine: "The 'star wars' program, in the form it has been conceived, will violate -- one way or another -- all the arms control treaties concluded with great difficulty between the Soviet Union and the United States.

"These are the treaties banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater; the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty; the ABM Treaty; and the SALT I and SALT II treaties."

One should mention that the President made several attempts to justify his commitment to the idea of militarizing outer space by claims that the USSR has since long conducted similar work.

This allegation does not correspond to reality.

The United States initiated the development of an antisatellite system (ASAT) long before satellites appeared in orbit. Way back in 1964, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson said: "The British dominated the seas and ruled the world. The United States dominated the air and led the free world ever since it established this domination. The situation will now be controlled by those who will dominate outer space."

And these were not merely words.

As early as the dawn of the space era, the United States embarked on the road of exploring space as a potential sphere of armed struggle, developed a concept of antisatellite weapons. It became the first country to have tested an ASAT way back in October 1959, intercepting an artificial earth satellite, Explorer-6, with a missile launched from a B-47. The development of an interceptor spacecraft, Saint, was started in the early sixties. Two ground-based ASAT's were established: on Kwajalein Island on the basis of Nike-Zeus anti-missiles in 1963 and on Johnston Island with the use of the Thor missile in 1964. Simultaneously, the United States carried out work in the field of developing space strike systems (for warfare from outer space against earth).

The Soviet Union was compelled to respond to all these U.S. "initiatives" and adopt countermeasures to ensure its security. The USSR started developing its own antisatellite system considerably later (in the late sixties). As is well-known, several years ago the Soviet Union proposed not only banning, but destroying antisatellite systems.

By now, the doctrine of domination in outer space, the militant philosophy that "the one to be first in outer space will be first on earth" have become integral parts of U.S. state policy. The U.S. military openly talk about that. Edward Aldridge, under secretary of the Air Force, declared: "One does not require particular imagination to understand the country controlling outer space might control the world."

The United States is now accelerating the development of a second-generation antisatellite system (ASAT). Several tests have already been conducted, including against a real target in space. The system is to be adopted for service in the near future. Besides, space shuttles possess antisatellite capabilities (removing earth satellites from orbit, rendering them useless).

It was not our task to study the psychology of the White House chief. It was more important for us to ascertain his position on major isues of our time. However, after talking with his closest aides and with the President himself, we were able to observe the laboratory of White House political thinking to some extent from the inside.

The old truth that judgement should be made on the basis of deeds, rather than words, is well-known and indisputable. It applies to the essence of policy. Another factor is also important: how words correlate to deeds. In other words, the point at issue is the formula of political ethics within the U.S. Administration.

The problem, not the least insignificant, is that people who provide the leadership, including at the highest level, should be basically conscientious with information. Taking about our personal impressions, the most disquieting of them is, probably, that we saw yet another time with what lightness they in the White House report to a direct distortion of truth; how much stereotypes, worked out by U.S. propaganda, dominate them: and how deeply they seem to be convinced that the rest of the world is either not informed about the real state of affairs on our planet, or forgetful, or obliged to think the way they think in the White House.

This impression, of course, is not new and it was not only formed on the basis of our conversation with the President. But precisely on these days: when especially many interviews are given in the White House, when the U.S. President recently made a lengthy speech at the jubilee session of the UN General Assembly. This impression, one might say, has become particularly strong, acquiring very clear and alarming outlines.

One more thing. On the days when a special sense of responsibility is required from the leadership of such a great country as the United States, the conviction has strengthened that it lacks this responsibility.

One of the most graphic examples is the President's reply to the question about the U.S. invasion of Grenada. Two years ago, when the world was shooked by the landing of U.S. Marines on the tiny island, the White House immediately advanced, one after the other, two "justifications" of the action. First, the bandit assault on the sovereign insular state and the overthrow by force of its govenment were explained by Washington's concern over the fate of U.S. students on the island.

But since none of the U.S. students were ever threatened there (this was widely known and confirmed later), another explanation was put forward: Representatives of "Caribbean insular democracies" phoned the U.S. President at daybreak and asked him to "join their Armed Forces in order to restore democracy and order in Grenada."

In an interview with us, the U.S. President, obviously realizing that all these explanations not only were unable to justify the U.S. intervention in Grenada, but, on the contrary, highlighted the illegitimacy of the armed aggression against the tiny island, made the striking statement: "We had some several hundred young U.S. medical students there (in Grenada). Our intelligence revealed they were threatened as potential hostages and the Government of Grenada requested help, military help, not only from the United States, but from Commonwealth states -- Dominica, and a number of others."

We did not mention the fact that this explanation is totally inconsistent with the truth. Even a totally uninformed person will hardly imagine that the Grenadian Government would request that anyone overthrow it by military force...

It is hard to imagine that people in Washington have "forgotten" at whose request and for what end they landed their Marines on the tiny island 2 years ago, occupied it, overthrew its government, killed hundreds of innocent people, who in no way threatened the United States, and established an order there that suited Washington.

The point at issue is not forgetfulness, but imperial thinking based on the postulate of the cave-dwellers' law: The strong are always right.

The White House's present explanation of the intervention against Grenada sounds just as "convincing" as the U.S. President's revelation made the other day in a talk with a correspondent from the British Broadcasting Corporation: "Our two systems (the United States and USSR -- note by the authors) so diametrically opposed that -- I'm no linguist but I have been told that in the Russian language there isn't even a word for freedom." And although the Washington administration's linguistic studies are hardly comparable with its occupation of an independent state by its troops, both nevertheless attest to its contemptuous attitude toward other countries and peoples.

The strange remarks about the Russian language, far as they are from the problems that worry today's world, belong to the same Washington's "documentarianism".

The assertions that the United States did not use its nuclear monopoly in the first post-war years do not correspond to reality either (it is another thing that the policy of atomic blackmail failed). Soviet people know that the USSR figured in Washington's official documents starting from the autumn of 1945 not only as a potential enemy, but also as a target for atomic attack. This follows from the subsequently published plans: Gunpowder, Dropshot, and others. Since B-29 bombers were the only atomic bomb delivery vehicles at the time, U.S. strategists aimed at encircling the USSR with a ring of military bases and, in order to have a pretext for building the bases, formed military alliances around the Soviet borders. The results of the policy are felt even now. 550,000 U.S. servicemen are stationed outside U.S. territory, often thousands of kilometers away from U.S. national borders. 1,500 U.S. military bases have been set up 32 countries.

The USSR has nothing of the kind. According to the U.S. President, the United States keeps troops and has bases abroad for the sake of discharging its duty to the allies. In actual fact, matters stand differently. Military alliances have been formed for the sake of an opportunity to create bases in strategically important areas of the world and to deploy U.S. nuclear weapons as close to Soviet territory as possible.

The White House chief described attempts to revolve problems in different parts of the world with the help of military force as one of the causes of tension in Soviet-U.S. relations. He denied that it is characteristic of the United States to wage wars in other countries and to oppose the will of any people wanting self-determination.

"But," the President added, "when we see other nations threatened from the outside by forces which would destroy their liberties and impose the rule of a minority by force of arms, we will help them resist that whenever we can."

If there were a naive person, who would take at face value this camouflaged form of the export of counterrevolution, he could have thought, for example, that Washington had supported the Vietnamese patriots agains the French colonialists. In actual fact, the U.S. military, having picked up the baton of the dirty war from Paris, gave it the character of genocide, killing several million people. More than 7 million metric tons of bombs were dropped on the country. Half of the U.S. strategic aviation and a third of the U.S. tactical aviation, the main forces of the Seventh Fleet and the expeditionary corps at a strength of over half a million were used in order to force the Vietnamese people to their knees and to impose a clique of U.S. puppets upon them.

How did the President portray that disgraceful page in the U.S. post-war history in the interview with the Soviet journalists? According to him, there was no military intervention. He said that an international forum in Geneva had established a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese requested that the United States to send instructors to create an army which they had not had before. But the Americans were harrassed by terrorists from the very outset -- not even being allowed to watch movie in peace.

The military advisors had to be armed. Then troops had to be sent in to protect them. That grew into the war in Vietnam. At no time did the U.S. troops try for victory there (maybe, according to the President, that's what was wrong).

The U.S. troops simply tried to maintain a demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. But in the end Vietnam became one state.

Such an interpretation of events gives rise to surprise, to say the least. Elections were held throughout Vietnam in 1946 and Ho Chi Minh was elected President. France's intervention led to a new war. It was precisely the Geneva agreements on Indochina, which the President referred to, that envisaged the unification of Vietnam as far back as in 1956. And it was precisely the United States as the French occupiers' "successor," which frustrated the unification.

No, it was not at all for the sake of "maintaining a demilitarised zone" that Washington got involved in the years-long sanguinary war. That was a desperate and unsuccessful attempt by the U.S. imperialist circles to turn backwards the decolonization process and by military force to deprive the Vietnamese people of the results of their persistent struggle for national and social liberation.

In the interview with us, the President tried to present the case so as to show that the main obstacle to the strengthening of international peace is ostensibly the struggle for social and economic independence, the struggle which is being waged at a cost of tremendous sacrifices by countries and peoples that have freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism and imperialism. Reagan specially singled out such countries as Angola, Afghanistan, and Cambodia, the question of which, as he put it, "has created enormous tension in U.S.-Soviet relations over the last few years."

He even assured us that the Soviet Union "occupies" Angola, South Yemen, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan. The whole world knows that, say, in Angola, there are no Soviet troops. It is also well-known that the United States tries to arm Jonas Savimbi's bands, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] and directs their actions. The President assured us that the purpose of the United States is "to find a way to stop attempts to solve problems by force...to stop armed struggle and find a solution through talks." But while these words were being pronounced in the Oval Office, a bill on the granting of $27 million as military aid to Savimbi's band in Angola was introduced in Congress with the blessing of the White House.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, arms and money have long been supplied to the "anti-communist freedom fighters" in Angola "through secret channels of the Central Intelligence Agency in cooperation with the South African regime." After the abrogation of the so-called Clark Amendment last summer, the amendment which formally banned such activities, the flow of aid sharply increased. However, as THE NEW YORK TIMES emphasizes, the Washington administration inclines more and more to "providing Savimbi with military aid openly." This is stated virtually openly in a statement issued by the U.S. State Department on Friday. The statement stresses: "We want to give support to UNITA," and also reports that the question about a "form and method" of rendering such support will be decided upon shortly.

Washington has already allocated 1,500 million dollars for arms to military bands which are infiltrated into Afghanistan directly from the training camps where U.S. officers train the counterrevolutionaries in burning down Afghan schools together with the pupils, in shooting to death the teachers who teach peasants to read and write, and in massacring mullahs who consider that the people's power in Afghanistan serves the interests of the working people, and not the feudals.

The fact that the feudals and their lackeys are against the people's system in Afghanistan is only natural. The fact that they would like to regain the lands and medieval power over the people is natural, too. But what have Washington's vows that it gives support only to the forces of democracy got to do with all that? One cannot fail to pay attention to the peculiar, to put it mildly, political vocabulary of the White House. When legitimate assistance is rendered to peoples who have chosen the road of freedom, Washington terms that "occupation" whereas coups which are carried out in U.S. interests are hurriedly described in Washington as "liberation".

It is impossible not to express indignation at the fact that the U.S. President did not fail to voice monstrous libel to the effect that Soviet people are using "booby traps" in the shape of toys in Aghanistan, which cripple children. However, it must be recalled that booby traps are a U.S. invention and they were used way back in Indochina. At present they are being used by the USA's hirelings in the DRA.

Of course, the national-liberation and revolutionary movement in the world can be explained by the scheming of "Marxist-Leninists" (this is what the President spoke of in his address at the session of the U.N. General Assembly -- note by the authors), by the Soviet Union's and Socialist Cuba's baleful "interference" in the internal affairs of those states. But if one takes the trouble to recall history if only within the scope of primary school, this question immediately arises: What kind of "Marxist-Leninists" compelled the Nicaraguan people to fight the U.S. Marines that invaded that country at the beginning of the century? Neither the Soviet Union, nor Socialist Cuba existed at that time.

But it was precisely the U.S. Marines that installed the Somoza family of dictators in power in Nicaragua. Washington supported it most actively until the power of Somoza, and together with it the power of U.S. monopolies in Nicaragua, was swept away by the Revolution of 1979.

Since then the United States has been waging a veritable war against the young republic. The Somozist bands, on instructions from U.S. advisers, have killed 12,000 people in Nicaragua in recent years with U.S. weapons. If this figure is compared to scale with the USA, it would mean the killing of a million Americans (twice the number of the U.S. losses in World War II -- note by the author). In Nicaragua, 3,500 children have been killed or wounded, 246 pupils and teachers have been kidnapped, and 360 schools cannot function because they are constantly raided by bands which undergo training at U.S. military camps in Honduras, Florida and California.

Just note the "coincidence" of the goals of the bandits in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Angola: the war against schools, hospitals, education and health.

Two years ago, the U.S. ambassador in Nicaragua explained Washington's actions to one of us in the following way: "The Sandinists promised democracy, but they did not hold elections. If they held elections, the U.S. actions would have changed."

Free and democratic elections were held in Nicaragua in November last year. A record number of voters took part, candidates of various parties stood for election. The Sandinists won with a convincing majority of votes.

Nevertheless, Washington did not alter its policy against the Nicaraguan people even following the elections.

The argument was rather simple: "The elections in Nicaragua were not free, were not democratic." Washington may justify with equal success bandit actions against Nicaragua, including air raids and mining of ports, by referring to rainy or, on the contrary, dry weather.

Well, here is one more remark on the U.S. "concern" for elections and "democracy."

The year is 1970. Elections in Chile are won by a former Chilean senator, a person known throughout the country -- Salvador Allende. He achieves the victory without "military" aid from Cuba and without "military" aid from the Soviet Union. He wins because he promises the country liberation from the domination of U.S. monopolies and improvement in the life of working people. On coming to power, he starts acting according to his program, for which the Chilean people elected him.

No one questioned the legitimacy of the voting. No one dared claim that Allende turned Chile into a "center of international political terror." But the Chilean president was killed in a fascist putsch masterminded in Washington. The fascist minority rule was installed in the country with support from military force from the outside, a support which continues until today.

One would like to know the U.S. President's view -- why doesn't Washington help freedom fighters in Chile, the fighters against fascism imposed on that country by Washington?

One more thing one would like to learn from the U.S. President: What should one regard as the "imposition of alien ideology from outside" -- maybe the crimes, already perpetrated or being perpetrated by the United States, against Chile, against Grenada, against Nicaragua, against El Salvador, against Guatemala, against Afghanistan, against Vietnam, against Ethiopia, against many other countries in many parts of the world.

We would like, nevertheless, to end our article on an optimistic note. Life flows, people everywhere strive for peace, and this could be easily spotted in Washington as well during the few days we spent here in anticipation of the interview with President Reagan.

The interview turned out to be contradictory. The good words about peace, about the striving for accord with the Soviet Union went side by side with unfounded accusations about our country's foreign policy. It seems it takes an immense effort to find a way out of the pale of ideological prejudices. Still, the very fact of the recognition of the need for extensive Soviet-U.S. dialogue is a positive sign. This time of words is going away. The time of actions has arrived. One would like to believe that the USSR's readiness to achieve a drastic turn for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations will encounter in Geneva a constructive response from the U.S. side. The world is looking forward to this.

G. Shishkin,
V. Ovchinnikov,
S. Kondrashov,
G. Borovik
Washington, D.C. November

SHULTZ, SHEVARDNADZE DISCUSS 'SECURITY ISSUES'

LD041532 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, 4 Nov (TASS) -- Talks were held today between E.A. Shevardnadze member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, during which questions of Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed and a number of international problems in the context of preparations for the forthcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva.

Attention was focused chiefly upon examing security issues, primarily those which are the subject of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons.

Taking part in the negotiations were: on the Soviet side: G.M. Korniyenko, first deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs; V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; A.F. Dobrynin, USSR ambassador to the United States; A.A. Bessmertnykh and A.S. Chernyshev, members of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Colegium; and Yu.A. Kvitinskiy, roving ambassador; on the U.S. side: R. McFarlane, presidential national security adviser, A. Hartman, U.S. ambassador to the USSR; P. Nitze, special advisor to the President and secretary of state on arms limitations talks [as received]; R. Ridgway, assistant secretary of state; J. Matlock, presidential adviser for European and Soviet affairs; and M. Palmer, deputy assistant secretary of state.

The same day E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in honor of G. Shultz, which was attended by those participating in the talks on both sides.

Shultz Meets With Gorbachev

LD050736 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0726 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, 5 Nov (TASS) -- A conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and George Shultz, U.S. Secretary of State, has begun in the Kremlin today.

The U.S. secretary of state arrived in Moscow yesterday on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

YURCHENKO DISCUSSES 'DEFECTION' WITH PRESS

LD050725 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0620 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, 5 Nov (TASS) -- On 4 November at the USSR Embassy in Washington a press conference was held for U.S. and foreign journalists. It was arranged at the request of Vitaliy Yurchenko, a Soviet diplomatic official [Sovetskiy otvetstvennyy diplomaticheskiy sotrudnik].

As is known, the U.S. mass media have been reporting sensationally that Yurchenko allegedly came to the United States of his own volition and requested political asylum there.

This is totally false. As Yurchenko himself recounted, at the beginning of August this year, while he was in Italy on official business, he was kidnapped in Rome by unknown persons who used force. He was dispatched unconscious, under the influence of powerful substances, across the ocean.

In the United States he was held in isolation, forced to take some substances (preparaty) and given no opportunity to contact Soviet officials. The Soviet embassy several times demanded that the State Department arrange a personal meeting with Yurchenko. However, the reply was always that Yurchenko himself did not desire such a meeting.

Only on 2 November, said Yurchenko, "taking advantage of inattention on the part of those keeping me under observation, was I able to escape and reach the Soviet Embassy."

For almost 3 months Yurchenko was subjected to a ceaseless and intensive brainwashing. The torturers, as he calls the CIA personnel who busied themselves with him during that time, wanted to break his will, to break him down, so as to obtain information of interest to U.S. intelligence. He was not left alone for one moment. Isolating him from the world outside, the special services enveloped him in their "tender care". "Even when I went to bed," he said, "my door was always left ajar, and in the next room I could always see a brawny thug with an obtuse expression on his face. He never took his eyes off me."

Powerful substances were also used. In addition, Yurchenko was constantly threatened, and attempts were made to convince him that he was a traitor, and therefore had better renounce the very idea of returning home, where, supposedly, either prison or death awaited him. The CIA also resorted to the aid of the "free press". At the urging of the espionage agency, the U.S. mass media unleashed a frenzied anti-Soviet campaign aimed at discrediting Yurchenko and creating the impression that he had been working for U.S. intelligence for many years. The CIA "did not omit" to acquaint Yurchenko with material appearing on this subject.

When this did not work, they promised money, "financial security to the end of my days." Not long before Yurchenko succeeded in fleeing from his torturers, he was invitied by none other than one of the closest aides of William Casey, the director of the CIA, proposing than an open-ended contract be concluded, under which Yurchenko, in exchange for his "cooperation" with U.S. intelligence, was promised a million dollars as a "one-time grant", a "guaranteed salary of $62,000 per year", and other "benefits" of this type. Even a meeting with Casey was arranged.

What the Soviet diplomat called real torture -- in essence nothing less than another act of state terrorism perpetrated by those who proclaim for all the world to hear that they are dedicated to the "struggle against international terrorism" -- lasted almost 3 months. What other appraisal can there be of what happened to Yurchenko, a person who held a diplomatic passport and was at the moment of his kidnapping not in the United States, but in quite another country?

This was not only an act of terrorism. It was a flagrant violation of the basic human rights of a Soviet diplomat, who, by means of drugs and threats of reprisals they endeavored to deprive of the ability to think and feel, endeavored to turn into a dumb animal which would obey without a murmur those who had sanctioned this monstrous abuse of a human being. An abuse was perpetrated which cannot be fitted into either the framework of any general human concept of morality and justice, nor that of international law, by those who are wont to cry louder than anyone else that over there, in the East, "civil rights and freedoms are violated", those who enjoy donning the mantle of champion of these freedoms.

Today the Soviet Embassy issued a resolute protest to the U.S. State Department and demanded that those guilty of the crime committed against Yurchenko receive appropriate punishment, and that the U.S. side apologize for its actions.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 0810 GMT on 5 November transmits the following "correction" substituting the following paragraph for the last paragraph above:

The Soviet Embassy has handed the U.S. State Department a note in which the actions of the U.S. authorities with regard to Soviet citizen Vitaliy Yurchenko are qualified as illegal and inhuman (protivopravnye i beschelovechnye), and a resolute protest is made in this connection. In the note it is demanded that those who carried out this crime should be severely punished, and that no obstacles should be put in the way of Vitaliy Yurchenko's immediate exit from the United States to the Soviet Union.]

U.S. SUPPORTS TERRORISM IN MOVE AGAINST QADHDHAFI

LD041916 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 4 Nov 85

["The Policy of State Terorrism in Action" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 4 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov:

The report that appeared in THE WASHINGTON POST Sunday to the effect that the Reagan administration sanctioned a covert CIA operation against the leader of the Libyan revolution Mu'ammar Al-Qadhdhafi caused a regular alarm [as received] in Washington. Unlike in the past when such revelations had not caused rapid and direct reaction of the White House, this time it was quick in coming. A White House spokesman said that the President was extremely annoyed at how the information about the plan had leaked to the press and ordered a special enquiry.

This means that the existence of the plan for toppling the progressive regime in Libya, the plan that was kept secret until now, is actually not denied, and concern is expressed only over the fact that the secret has become public.

Moreover, an administration spokesman, as the American press reports today, made it plain that the disclosure of the plan would not lead to its cancellation. He expressed the view that the opponents of the plan would not be able to defeat it even after the scandalous leak of information about the plan.

The matter is that the political, military and economic pressure on sovereign Libya, attempts to destabilize the situation inside and around it, to topple the Libyan Government, not stopping short of an attempt on the life of the leader of the Libyan revolution, have long become one of the areas of work of the present Washington administration. One has only to recall the provocative incident over the Gulf of Sidra where U.S. Air Force fighters downed two Libyan patrol planes, or large-scale military maneuvers that were held near Libya's eastern frontiers and threatened its security. A steady buildup of the U.S. military presence in the eastern Mediterranean also serves that subversive purpose.

Heavy reliance on force, incessant threats to use it against Libya underlie the American policy toward that independent Arab country. A trade and economic blockade of Libya, and a high-pressure campaign of slander against that country -- all this serves the aims of such a policy. Washington deliberately spreads the myth about Libya's alleged involvement in "international terrorism".

However, the true reason why Washington conspires against Libya is its consistent and independent policy, its active support for the just cause of the Palestine people and the national liberation movements. "We want to be a free, nonaligned country and we refuse to bow to Washington," Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi said about his country's course.

The "green light" given by the White House to the Central Intelligence Agency and other secret services in their criminal actions against Libya is a fresh instance of international terrorism which has been elevated to the status of state policy of the U.S.

U.S. IMPERIALIST THREAT TO CHINA CITED

OW040206 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Volskiy commentary: "China Is Also Threatened by the Imperialist Principle of Social Revenge"]

[Text] The imperialist attempt to reverse the course of history is demonstrated in, first of all, the policy of the United States. From the arms race instigated by the Pentagon and ammunition monopolizing organizations to undeclared wars against young countries that have chosen the progressive road of development; from assaults on the rights of laboring people in advanced capitalist countries to tricky ideological sabotage against the socialist states -- all of these embody the hodgepodge of the principle of social revenge pursued by the Reagan administration.

This principle, reflecting the selfish interests of the most reactionary group among the U.S. monopolist capital, is primarily directed against the Soviet Union and the socialist community, which are regarded by the U.S. imperialists as obstacles to their efforts to establish global hegemony. However, the U.S. imperialist policy is directed against not only members of the socialist community, but also other countries. As emphatically pointed out in the draft of the CPSU's new program, the imperialists are cruelly opposing social progress in an attempt to obstruct the course of history, undermine the stand of socialism, and carry out social revenge on a global scale. U.S. imperialism is the pillar of support for international reactionaries as well as the primary threat of war.

The threat is in fact casting a cloud over all countries in the world. China is no exception. The imperialists never exclude China from the targets of their scheme. In fact, China is a prominent target in the scheme. This can be proven by Washington's theory and practice, including Reagan's recent speech at the meeting marking the anniversary of the United Nations. Although China was not mentioned in the speech, the program outlined by the U.S. President clearly revealed Washington's objectives against all people's countries that carried out revolution in different periods, especially those that have chosen the socialist road or are building socialism. The U.S. President did not conceal his hatred toward the new social system and discussed a series of objectives against these countries. Two most important objectives are: First, to make them return to the world economy, which means subjugation to multinational conglomerates and the International Monetary Fund; and second, to make them return to the big family of free countries, which means joining the imperialist military and political system in various forms of the revived exploiting system.

It is no secret that the U.S. imperialists have long actively pursued these objectives in their relations with China. As a matter of fact, U.S. banks and multinational conglomerates not only hope to derive huge profits from China, but are also attempting to gradually destroy the socialist foundation in China. This view was (?elaborated) in THE NEW YORK TIMES a few years ago.

As for the U.S. imperialists' military and political pressure on China, there are plenty of facts to prove this point. U.S. troops equipped with nuclear weapons are deployed near the Chinese border, on both land and sea, in all directions, or with access to bases in these areas. The United States has stationed 40,000 expeditionary troops in South Korea; dispatched the 7th Fleet to the Pacific; built bases in Japan, the Philippines, and Micronesia; and penetrated into various spheres of life in Pakistan.

Taiwan has also played the role of a U.S. base. The United States has continued to provide support, including military support, to Taiwan's Kuomintang reactionary authorities. At the same time, the United States has pursued a two-China policy and willfully interfered in China's internal affairs.

Is it a coincidence that China is the center of the whole U.S. strategy in East Asia? Of course not. Since the Chinese people carried out the revolution against imperialism and feudalism 35 years ago, the U.S. imperialists have never abandoned the use of all means to reverse the course of social development in China, never stopped social revenge on the country, and never given up the attempt to ultimately establish an imperialist-ruled country in China. Moreover, the escalation of the imperialists' policy of confrontation with the socialist countries in the Far East, based on nuclear weapons and the "star wars" plan, also constitutes a threat to the existence of the Chinese people. The danger is grave. However, the more serious the danger is, the greater (?the differences can be). All progressive and peace-loving forces should strengthen their unity in the struggle for peace, independence, and progress.

PRC-U.S. HELICOPTER MANUFACTURING DEAL SIGNED

PM041653 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Second Edition p 3

["Own information" report: "Sino-U.S. Agreement"]

[Text] XINHUA has reported that a Sino-U.S. agreement on joint helicopter production has been signed in Guangzhou City. Under the agreement the Guangzhou No. 3 Machine Building Plant and the U.S. firm Orlando Helicopter Airways, Inc. of Florida will annually produce more than 100 S-55, S-58, and and S-62 helicopters. The agreement has been signed for a 20-year period. For the first 5 years the Sino-U.S. joint enterprise will assemble helicopters from U.S.-manufactured parts and subsequently it will use Chinese-manufactured parts.

U.S. NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINE LEAVES YOKOSUKA

LD012001 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Tokyo, November 1 TASS -- The U.S. nuclear-powered submarine "Buffalo" has left today the port of Yokosuka, which has been turned with the blessing of the Japanese authorities into a U.S. nuclear-strategy strongpoint in the Far East. The "Buffalo" is one of the submarines equipped by the Pentagon with nuclear cruise missiles Tomahawk. As follows from the local press, the activeness of submarine missile carriers around the Japanese isles has increased this year to reach a scale unprecedented in post-war times. U.S. nuclear-powered submarines have called at the port of Yokosuka alone more than 30 times this year.

Kharkov Analysis

LD020044 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 1 Nov 85

["The Pentagon's Place d'Armes" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov.

The calls of U.S. nuclear-armed naval ships at Japanese ports have become so frequent of late that the "visit" of the nuclear-powered submarine "Buffalo" at Yokosuka which ended today would not have drawn so much attention if it had not been for some special circumstances. The point is that the U.S. submarine, like a number of other ships of the 7th U.S. Fleet, has already been armed with nuclear-tipped long-ragne cruise missiles. Its latest call at Yokosuka has set a record of sorts, marking an unprecedented level of activity of U.S. nuclear-armed naval ships off the coasts of Japan. This year U.S. nuclear-powered submarines called more than 30 times at Yokosuka alone.

Yokosuka, one of the largest naval bases of militarist Japan, has now become a link in the American nuclear-missile strategy in the Asian and Pacific region. But Yokosuka is not Japan's only port to which American nuclear-armed submarines and surface ships are assigned. The United States uses some other bases of the former Japanese Imperial Navy after they were appropriately modernized to meet the American demands. Sasebo is another such port. The nuclear-missile capability off the Japanese isles has been beefed up by strategic bombers based in Okinawa and [remainder of item not received]

COMMENTARY VIEWS ROLE OF U.S. BASES ON OKINAWA

OW311155 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] The KYODO news service has recently published the results of an opinion poll conducted by the Prime Minister's Office in Okinawa. The results show that an overwhelming majority of the people of Okinawa Prefecture are opposed to U.S. military bases deployed on the island.

Moscow Radio commentator Dmitriyev comments on this.

The results of the opinion poll prove that the island people recognize the role played by U.S. military bases on Okinawa. Many respondents think that the U.S. military bases on Okinawa are not only unnecessary for the security of Japan and Okinawa itself, but also constitute a direct threat.

In view of the scale of the U.S. forces' use of Okinawa, we can not but agree with this view. One-fifth of Okinawa's land is occupied by U.S. military facilities, and we think that this huge ratio is found nowhere else in the world.

About half of the U.S. forces in Japan are concentrated on this relatively small island. The Pentagon, the U.S. Department of Defense, attaches importance to Okinawa because, first of all, the island is geographically located to suit American strategists' aggressive designs. Put simply, the U.S. military can use Okinawa as a relay point in committing their troops from the homeland to the Asian region where they want to launch new military adventures.

They did so at the time of the U.S. aggression in Korea and Vietnam. Even now, the U.S. forces use Okinawa when they move their troops massively to South Korea where they conduct military exercises on a regular basis.

However, Okinawa's role is not limited only to that of a springboard for aggression. Attesting to this is the fact that large U.S. military units are stationed on Okinawa at all times. Okinawa, for instance, has become a permanent station for Rapid Deployment Forces [RDF] whose mission is to carry out military actions promptly anywhere on earth under the Pengagon's command. The RDF's mission as an initial strike force in the aggressive U.S. strategies for Asia and other parts of the world has nothing to do with defense. The deployment of these forces to Okinawa means that the U.S. military are changing the island into a combat post where they can supervise the situation in the broad Asian and Pacific region and turn its development at any time in the direction they want through armed interventions.

The most dangerous aspect about America's lording it over Okinawa is the fact that Okinawa is being used as an advance base for U.S. nuclear strategies. According to testimonies by military experts, Kadena Air Base, the biggest of all U.S. air bases in Japan, functions as an important strong-point in the nuclear (?network) plan worked out by U.S. forces on the entire Japanese territory.

In case a nuclear conflict breaks out in the Far East and Asia, the Pentagon plans to use Kadena as a liaison point for military actions. On top of that, the Pentagon's recent moves have made clear that the F-15 [illegible]S. Air Force planes deployed on Okinawa are equipped with electronics apparatuses used in the satellite attack system -- ASAT.

The Pentagon is binding Okinawa more strongly in its nuclear strategy by drawing the island into the realization of the star wars plan. Noteworthy is the fact that U.S. Marines stationed on Okinawa regularly conduct exercises under nuclear war conditions.

The Pentagon is making concrete preparations for the use of mass-destruction weapons. This is attested to by the fact that the Okinawa-based RDF are equipped with missile howitzers capable of launching nuclear and chemical shells.

What is the purpose of these? An objective answer to this question leads to the conclusion that the Pentagon is imposing on Okinawa the fate of turning into a nuclear battleground.

This military enterprise of the United States in Okinawa does not leave the livelihood of the islanders unaffected. In the face of protests by the people of Okinawa Prefecture, U.S. forces carry out exercises on the island incessantly. When artillery firing exercises are conducted, many areas are placed off limits for a long time and, because of this, the island's traffic is paralyzed.

American soldiers deport themselves on Okinawa as if it were somewhere in Texas, and the local in habitants living in the neighborhood of U.S. military bases fall prey to their barbarous behavior.

One may wish to think that Okinawa is an island far removed from U.S. military bases; but, as a matter of fact, that is impossible. Numerous acts of violence, murder, and destruction are committed by servicement from U.S. military installations against the local populace. Statistics show that there is no room for Okinawa, loaded with U.S. gunpowder, to lead a peaceful life. The per capita income level of the Okinawan people is 25 percent lower than that of the national average in Japan, and the unemployment rate is twice as high.

KCNA CITED ON EUROPEANS' VIEW OF KOREAN 'DANGER'

PM011137 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Nov 85 p 3

[Unnamed TASS correspondent's dispatch: "Great Danger"]

[Text] Pyongyang -- [No date given] -- The agressive U.S. intrigues in the Korean Peninsula pose a great danger to the cause of peace in the Far East and throughout the world. According to KCNA reports, this was emphasized at a session of the cooperation committee of societies for friendship and solidarity with the Korean people from northern European countries. It took place in Geneva and was attended by representatives of the region's progressive public and also by a Workers Party of Korea [WPK] delegation headed by Hwang Chang-yop, secretary of the WPK Central Committee.

DRA'S KARMAL RECEIVES TAJIK SSR'S MAKHKAMOV

PM031459 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "DRA-USSR: Arrival of Delegation"]

[Text] Kabul, 30 Oct -- B. Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, has received a Soviet delegation headed by K. Makhkamov, chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, which has arrived here to take part in the Afghan-Soviet Friendship Days.

DRA PROTESTS IRANIANS' ATTACK IN BORDER AREA

LD020016 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Kabul, November 1 TASS -- According to a BAKHTAR news agency report, Iran's charge d'affaires to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, was summoned to the Foreign Ministry of Afghanistan where the following statement was made to him.

On October 3 this year, an armed group of 400 men including members of counter-revolutionary Afghan groupings and Iranian servicemen from among the Corps of the "Guards of the Islamic Revolution" launched an armed attack against a post of the security forces of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in Gazal Islam area. On October 24 and 25, Iranian artillery shelled the Sharshari border post, killing two Afghan servicemen and wounding another two.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares a strong protest to Iran and demands an immediate end to the acts of aggression which constitute a violation of the generally recognized international norms and principles of goodneighborliness. Failing which, the Iranian side will bear all responsibility for the dangerous consequences of these actions.

U.S. AID TO AFGHANISTAN REBELS CONDEMNED

GF311459 Baku International Service in Azeri 1300 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Unattributed commentary: "Who Are the Afghan Counterrevolutionaries Fighting Against?"]

[Text] Dear listeners, Kabul radio has reported that the Friday Mosque in the city of Herat, in western Afghanistan, has been attacked. Over 50 people, who were praying in the mosque at the time, were killed, and 78 others were wounded by a missile fired at the mosque.

The shrine was filled with Muslims at the time of explosion. It was (?damaged) as a result of the blast. The bandit counterrevolutionaries were armed with a missile produced mainly by the United States. The counterrevolutionaries are described as the Bushmen in Afghanistan. However, Western press organs describe them as, God forbid, freedom fighters or defenders of Islam.

The Friday Mosque in Herat had attracted the attention of the, God forbid, defenders of Islam for a long time. For example, they planted three powerful explosives there last August. They should have exploded just before the evening prayer time. It was fortunate that they were discovered and rendered harmless. The Afghan fighters disclosed at the time that two of the explosives were manufactured in the United States and the third in Italy.

Now the dushmen are using other types of arms to achieve their objective. Hoping to escape punishment, the bandits open fire from their positions in the mountains. They fire at densely populated quarters in many of Afghanistan's cities and towns. Captured rebels disclose that U.S. and other foreign instructors at bases in Pakistan recommend that fire be directed at densely populated objects -- mosques, shops, movie theaters, hospitals, and schools included.

Ever since April 1978, that is to say ever since the beginning of the U.S. undeclared war against the populist government in Afghanistan, the rebels have either destroyed or burnt down 2,000 schools, 130 hospitals, and 254 mosques. Washington, on the other hand, has recently allocated $300 million to support the local dushmen. This is in addition to the $1 million spent for the, God forbid, Afghanistan issue.

In addition to attracting the dushmen with money and giving the bandits training, and arms, the Americans send representatives to Afghanistan to establish how the bandits use the arms they supply to them. One of these Americans was Charles Thornton. He visited one of the bandit bases in Qandahar Province where many bandit groups stay, including the group led by Saleh Mohammed. Saleh Mohammed himself presented the heads of many of those executed in the village of [words indistinct]. These executed peoplewere peasants, businessmen, youths who had the courage to attend school, and [word indistinct] teachers.

Afghanistan's officials have established that Charles Thornton and other Americans (?recommended) firing the ground-to-air missile that destroyed the Afghan passenger aircraft on 4 September. Fifty-two people on the aircraft, including seven women and six children, were killed. The civilian aircraft was destroyed according to the instructions of the organizers of the undeclared war. Likewise, similar instructions of the same organizers resulted in the Friday Mosque in Herat being fired upon.

DISCORD AMONG U.S. SUPPORTERS OF AFGHAN REBELS VIEWED

LD041441 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Igor Sugurchev commentary]

[Text] A U.S. ultraconservative organization under the name of Freedom to the Eagle has publicly accused McMahon, deputy director of the CIA, of supposedly hindering U.S. assistance to the gangs of Afghan counterrevolutionaries. Replying to this accusation, a CIA spokesman described it as "idiotic" an ASSOCIATED PRESS report says. This gave rise to a similar reaction in response. Here is a rejoinder by our commentator: A quarrel in a family that's far from noble. At the microphone is Igor Surguchev:

A most unusual skirmish has blown up on the other side of the ocean between the parents of the Afghan dushmans -- and they are people who join in the same dirty work together. The Freedom to the Eagle organization squeezes our contributions in the United States for the needs of the Afghan terrorists, while the CIA, as we know, uses these resources, together with allocations from its own budget, to finance counterrevolutionary gangs in Afghanistan. So they are united by a single criminal aim, that of stifling the Afghan revolution.

And suddenly we have a scandal -- and what a scandal! -- in the family of enemies of democratic Afghanistan across the ocean, a family that has hitherto been a friendly one.

The deputy chief of the CIA, who is personally in charge of supplying U.S. aid to the dushmans, has been accused of sabotage, and his resignation demanded. As McMahon's angry critics assert, he is the person to blame for the fact that far from the entire generous flow of aid from the United States is reaching those for whom it is intended. Whether or not this is so is not what's important: let the U.S. sponsors of the dushmans sort out their own internal family squabbles themselves.

One thing, however, is clear: The arguments within their camp have been caused by the absence of victory communiques from the camps of the Afghan counterrevolution. The bandits are suffering one defeat after another. They are as far away from overthrowing the popular democratic system in Afghanistan as the moon is from the earth, although the United States has already spent nearly $1 billion on the undeclared war against the republic. This money has gone for ever, as they say. And that is why the dushmans' helpers across the ocean are looking for explanations for the failures of their proteges, or more correctly, for scapegoats onto whom they can shift the blame for these failures. All this looks like pitiful petty intrigue against the background of the irreversible course of historic events in Afghanistan. Those in the United States and beyond its frontiers who dream of the triumph of counterrevolution in this Asian country ought to have understood long ago that neither the changing of CIA leaders nor the ever-increasing quantities of modern weapons nor even the hundreds of millions of dollars now being sent to the dushmans will be capable of halting the victorious march forward of the Afghan revolution, a revolution which is strong in the support of the people and its many loyal friends throughout the world.

DRA RECEPTION HELD FOR SOVIET SERVICEMEN

PM311324 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Major A. Oliynik report: "Reception for Distinguished Soviet Servicemen"]

[Text] Limited Contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan -- A reception of Soviet servicemen from the limited contingent of our troops in Afghanistan, who have displayed courage and heroism in giving international aid to the Afghan people in the defense of their revolutionary gains, was held at the DRA Army Main Political Directorate 29 October in connection with the Lenin Komsomol anniversary. Among the guests were Senior Lieutenant S. Grishkov, holder of the Order of the Red Star; Guards Sergeant V. Fedorov; Junior Sergeant I. Kuzmin; and Guards Private 1st Class S. Mamotin, who have been awarded the "For Valor" medal.

A warm welcoming speech was addressed to the Soviet servicemen by Major General (Sheykh Mukhammed), member of the republic's Revolutionary Council and first deputy chief of the DRA Army Main Political Directorate. He stressed that the Afghan people will always remember the image of the international servicemen who together with Afghan Army servicemen are defending the young republic from the forces of external counterrevolution and international reaction headed by the United States. Maj Gen (Sheykh Mukhammed) presented the Soviet servicemen with honor scrolls and souvenirs.

On behalf of the Komsomol activists in attendance a speech of thanks was delivered by political worker Major V. Andreyev.

REPORTAGE ON LAO DEFENSE MINISTER'S ACTIVITIES

Tours Kubinka Air Force Unit

PM041205 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Nov 85 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Minister's Stay"]

[Text] Army General K. Siphandon, member of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and Lao defense minister, visited an Air Force unit in Kubinka on 1 November. The Lao guest familiarized himself with the combat equipment and the lives of Soviet pilots. The Lao defense minister was met and shown around by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister. Army General K. Siphandon also visited the USSR Armed Forces Central Museum.

The Lao defense minister was accompanied by Army General A.T. Altunin, USSR deputy defense minister, and Lieutenant General G.A. Borisov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense External Relations Directorate.

Visits Officer Training Course

PM041703 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Trip Around the Country"]

[Text] Army General K. Siphandon, member of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and Lao defense minister, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the inivitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, visited the B.M. Shaposhnikov "Vystrel" Higher Officer Training Courses 2 November. The Lao guest familiarized himself with the instruction material base and the organization of the instruction process. The Lao defense minister met with and was shown around by Army General A.M. Mayorov, first deputy commander in chief of the Ground Forces. The same day Army General K. Siphandon, Lao defense minister, left on a trip around the country.

The Lao guest was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candiate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; Colonel General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General A.M. Mayorov, first deputy commander in chief of the Ground Forces; Colonel General of Aviation V.Y. Pankin, chief of the Air Forces General Staff; and other generals, admirals, and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces. Thongsavat Khaikhamphithoun, Lao ambassador to the Soviet Union, was among the send-off party.

The state flags of Laos and the USSR were hoisted at the airport and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Army General K. Siphandon, Lao defense minister, accepted the report of the chief of the honor guard and reviewed the Soviet servicemen.

The Lao defense minister is being accompanied on his trip around the country by Army General A.T. Altunin, USSR deputy defense minister, and Lieutenant General G.A. Borisov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense External Relations Directorate.

Visits Novosibirsk; Departs

LD050953 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 5 Nov 85

[From the "Time, Events, People" program]

[Text] Member of the Politburo of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, Laos Defense Minister Army General Khamtay Siphandon, has spent 3 days getting to know Novosibirsk. At Akademgorodok, the guest was told of the work of scientists of the Siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences aimed at exploiting the natural resources of Siberia and at accelerated development of its productive forces. He looked around the collections of the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. Siphandon visited Novosibirsk Higher Military Political Joint Services College named after the 60th anniversary of the Great October. He laid flowers at the monument to the glory of Siberian servicemen who gave their lives fighting for the homeland.

Today Khamtay Siphandon left the Soviet Union. He was in our country on an official friendly visit at the invitation of candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Defense Minister of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Sokolov.

RYABOV, MALAYSIAN LEADERS DISCUSS TIES, INDOCHINA

LD050949 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, 5 Nov (TASS) -- A Soviet Government delegation led by Yakov Ryabov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers visited Malaysia 1-5 November on an official visit at the invitation of the Malaysian Government.

The delegation was received by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed, and held talks with Deputy Prime Minister Musa Hitam, Minister of Foreign Affaris Ahmad Rithauddeen and other statesmen, and with representatives of business circles.

During the talks the two sides expressed satisfaction at the positive changes in relations between the Soviet Union and Malaysia, and confirmed their desire to develop bilateral relations in various fields on a long-term and mutually favorable basis. They called for expansion of political dialogue, and the continuation of the practice of regular political consultations between the foreign ministers of both countries, and of cultural and sports exchanges. The existence of favorable opportunities for developing trade, economic and scientific-technological cooperation was noted.

During the discussion of international problems, the attention of the Malaysian side was drawn to the broad complex of proposals for slowing the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and improving the international situation as put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Malaysian leaders welcomed the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and expressed hopes for its success.

The Soviet delegation reaffirmed the USSR's unchanging line on settling the problems facing Southeast Asia by political means. The Soviet side expressed support for the constructive course taken by the countries of Indochina toward normalizing the situation and establishing an atmosphere of good-neighborliness and cooperation in the region. The USSR welcomes the efforts of all states of the region in this direction.

Both sides expressed the opinion that the Soviet government delegation's visit to Malaysia will serve to further strengthen mutual understanding and trust between the two countries, and the development of Soviet-Malaysian relations.

On behalf of the Soviet Government the delegation conveyed an invitation to Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed to make an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

KOCHANOV REVIEWS SRV TIES ON TREATY ANNIVERSARY

LD022118 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Yevgeniy Kachanov commentary]

[Text] Tomorrow is the seventh anniversary of the USSR-SRV Friendship and Cooperation Treaty. The public of both fraternal countries are widely celebrating this important date. Here is our commentator, Yevgeniy Kachanov:

The Friendship and Cooperation Treaty, signed on 3 November 1978, is often called the foundation, the unshakable foundation, of Soviet-Vietnamese relations. It is clear, comrades, that even before it was concluded, relations between our countries developed, and developed dynamically. It is no secret that the Soviet Union's broad economic, political and military aid was an exceptionally important factor in the courageous Vietnamese people's defense of their independence in the struggle against French colonizers and U.S. imperialism, and for the unity of their motherland. But it was the treaty that placed relations between the two fraternal peoples on a firm international, legal basis, and moved them to a qualitatively new stage.

Take one aspect of these relations -- Soviet-Vietnamese economic cooperation. It is expected to make a substantial contribution toward solving the task of creating the material and technical base of socialism in Vietnam. With Soviet help, major power installations have been and are being constructed as are major projects in the coal, machine-building and transportation industries, and in agriculture. Already they allow the fraternal Vietnamese people to successfully carry out the most important national economic tasks. But it must be said that there is tremendous potential for broadening this cooperation, and that the main tasks are to increase its effectiveness, to improve the whole complex of bilateral economic ties on a long-term planned basis, to develop specialized production, and to implement specific mutually advantageous programs.

Special mention must be made of the major role played by the fraternal links between the two parties, the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] in the development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, links based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. The content of these links is constantly enriched through regular contacts between the leaders of the two parties and states. This summer they were given a fresh powerful impulse by the visit to Moscow of Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, and his talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The joint declaration adopted during this visit marked a move to a qualitatively new stage of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the SRV, in the name of the interests of both countries, the socialist community, and in the name of consolidating peace and security on our planet.

ANALYST ASSESSES U.S.'ADVENTURE' IN VIETNAM

LD021407 Moscow TASS in English 1022 GMT 2 Nov 85

["At Odds With History" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, November 2 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Mikhail Yakovlev writes:

Some U.S. press media publish materials which are evidence that the Washington politicians have a poor memory. Now they picture the American bloody adventure in Vietnam as "harmless" actions directed at preserving the demilitarization zone between North and South Vietnam.

The claim is, to put it mildly, an attempt at distorting the facts completely. As is known, the "dirty war" of the USA against the Vietnamese people began with the assistance to the French colonialists. When the Vietnamese patriots started an assault of the last stronghold of the colonialists, the U.S. National Security Council developed a plan of a special operation by the U.S. against Vietnam in the event of surrender of the Frenchmen. It even provided for the use of atomic bombs. The American militarists succeeded the French after the latter's defeat.

Washington was doing its utmost in an attempt at foiling the reunification of Vietnam, which was planned, under an agreement on Indochina, for 1956, but when its plans to strengthen the Saigon regime and overthrow the revolutionary power in Hanoi proved to be a failure, it took a course for open military interference in both parts of the country, a course for full-scale war against Vietnam and then Kampuchea and Laos.

In 1968, the numerical strength of the U.S. troops in Vietnam reached 550 thousand and ships of the Seventy Fleet were sent to the shores of Indochina. Sixty-eight per cent of the U.S. Infantry, 60 per cent of the Marines, 32 per cent of the tactical and 50 per cent of the Strategic Air Force were used against Vietnam. Nearly eight million tons of bombs were dropped on Vietnam, 48 million litres of the toxic substance "Agent Orange", from poisoning with which tens of thousands of Vietnamese and thousands of Americans are suffering until now, were sprayed over the fields and forests of Vietnam.

Only a naive person can believe that such a huge force was necessary only to preserve the demilitarized zone. Yet under the onset of the people of Vietnam and patriots of other countries of Indochina the intervention of U.S. imperialism ended in a defeat. The American aggressors were forced to withdraw from the sacred land of Vietnam, having paid for their adventure with 58 thousand men killed and 304 thousand wounded.

This way the biggest attempt of imperialism after the Second World War to make short shrift by means of arms of the socialist states and suppress the national liberation revolution suffered a failure. Those were precisely the aims and not some others, which have been invented by U.S. propaganda in unleashing the aggression against Vietnam and other countries of Indochina. But Washington has not learned this lesson. Now it is again trying to return to that region and almost in the same way. This is seen from its military and financial support for the Pol Pot terrorists.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS COOPERATION PACT WITH GDR

PM041045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Cooperation Developing"]

[Text] A protocol on the results of the coordination of the USSR and GDR state plans for 1986-1990 and the longer term was signed in Moscow 31 October.

The protocol was signed by N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan; and G. Schuerer, candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the GDR State Planning Commission.

Proceeding from the agreement in principle between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, on questions of the further development of all-around cooperation between the USSR and the GDR, the protocol provides for specific measures for the intensification of the division of labor and production specialization and sharing in fundamental sectors of the two countries' national economies with a view to intensifying social production and ensuring the stable and dynamic growth of reciprocal trade turnover.

In accordance with the decisions of the CEMA countries' economic summit conference and the program for the development of cooperation between the USSR and the GDR in the field of science, technology, and production for the period through 2000, the sides agreed to implement joint measures aimed at accelerating acientific-technical progress, making extensive use of the latest achievements of science and technology in production, improving the technical standard and quality of the output produced and delivered to each other, and updating its range.

Cooperation will develop rapidly in the development and production of articles of microelectronics, robots, machine tools with numerical program control, flexible production systems, processing centers, and computer and information technology ensuring rapid rates for labor productivity growth, and the saving of energy and raw and semifinished materials.

With a view to resolving the socioeconomic tasks which have been set, the sides agreed to use fully the potential of cooperation, including in the field of the production of foodstuffs and industrial consumer goods; to use the scientific-technical potential and experience which has been formed; and to implement measures to develop, update, and modernize the material-technical base of the agroindustrial complex and the light and food industry.

The trade turnover agreed for the forthcoming 5-year period will be in excess of R82 billion and will increase nearly 30 percent compared with the current 5-year period.

The Soviet Union will supply the GDR in the forthcoming 5-year period with equipment for atomic power stations, trucks, tractors, aviation equipment, articles of the electronics industry, and considerable volumes of oil, natural gas, coal, electricity, output of ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy and the chemical industry, lumber, cotton, and other goods.

In turn the GDR will substantially increase deliveries to the USSR of machine tools, railroad cars, ships, computer equipment, equipment for the metallurgical, coal, oil, gas, chemical, light, and food industries, and consumer goods including carpets, sewn and knitted articles, furniture, chinaware, and textiles.

The sides defined a number of industrial projects whose construction or modernization in cooperation between the USSR and the GDR is planned in the period 1986-1990. To ensure deliveries of iron ore and natural gas from the USSR, the GDR will take part, together with other CEMA countries, in the construction of the Krivoy Rog mining and enrichment combine and the Yamburg-western border of the USSR main gas pipeline. The Soviet Union will render the GDR assistance in installing a "2000" rolling mill at the "Ost" metallurgical combine.

The sides discussed the main avenues of the division of labor between the USSR and the GDR beyond 1990 and agreed on the long-term problems on which work will be continued.

CPSU WORKERS STUDY MSZMP PARTY BUILDING

PM041649 Moscow PRAVDA Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by N.S. Igrunov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Party Work Department, visited Hungary 29 October through 2 November in accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and MSZMP. The delegation acquainted itself with the MSZMP's experience in the sphere of party building and educating young party members.

The delegation was received by I. Horvath, Secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee.

E. EUROPE PARTIES, STATES HAIL WARSAW PACT PARLEY

GDR'S Honecker

PM041713 Moscow PRAVDA Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Main Aim"]

[Text] Berlin, 2 Nov -- A meeting has been held here between E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and chairmen of the political parties belonging to the GDR National Front. It was devoted to the results of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference in Sofia and the tasks in preparing for the 11th SED Congress.

The participants in the meeting welcomed the Political Consultative Committee conference's results and emphasized the great importance of the initiatives it put forward aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat and achieving an improvement in European and world affairs.

Addressing the assembly, E. Honecker stressed that the main aim of the Warsaw Pact states' foreign policy is to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear catastrophe, prevent the militarization of space, reduce the level of military confrontation, and develop international relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente.

The GDR wholly and fully supports the program of disarmament measures set out by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his official visit to France and the proposals contained in the statement adopted at the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference.

The forces of peace and progress must not lose sight of the course of furthering the arms race and confrontation that was adopted by the most aggressive U.S. and NATO circles. These plans are opposed by the Warsaw Pact states' peace program put forward in Sofia. It is also necessary to resolutely rebuff revanchist intrigues and attempts to review the postwar setup in Europe.

Czechoslovak Party, Government

PM011605 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conference Results Approved"]

[Text] Prague, 31 Oct -- The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government have discussed the results of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference in Sofia and approved the activity of the CSSR delegation headed by G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR.

The documents adopted at the conference, the report published here states, contain an in-depth analysis of the present situation in Europe and throughout the world and outline further joint actions by the allied socialist countries in the struggle for peace, the elimination of the nuclear threat, the ending of the arms race on earth, and the prevention of the militarization of space.

In close alliance with the fraternal socialist states, the CSSR will continue to make efforts to normalize the situation in the world, to revive the detente process and extend it to all spheres of international relations, and to ensure peace and security for the peoples of Europe and the whole planet.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government fully support the USSR's constructive position at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva and its new large-scale foreign policy initiatives. They entirely approve the other proposals contained in the statement of the pa-ticipants in the Political Consultative Committee's Sofia conference.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government, the report emphasizes, believe that the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting must promote the relaxation of dangerous tension in the world, the elimination of the threat of war, and the achievement of mutually acceptable accords whose goal is the ending of the arms race and a realistic approach to disarmament.

The report notes with satisfaction that the Sofia Political Consultative Committee conference, which was held in an atmosphere of freindship and comradely cooperation, reaffirmed the Warsaw Pact states' unity and cohesion and their determination to do everything to avert the threat of nuclear disaster and to ensure lasting peace.

POLISH-ROMANIAN TALKS HELD IN WARSAW

PM041248 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Plan Coordination"]

[Text] Warsaw, 31 Oct -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of ministers, received C. Dascalescu, member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and prime minister of the Romanian Government, who was here on a 1-day working visit.

The sides pointed out that the talks held will make it possible to complete in the very near future the work on coordinating the plans for the socioeconomic development of Poland and Romania in 1986-1990.

IZVESTIYA CITES GDR-PRC COOPERATION TALKS

PM041615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "GDR-PRC: Broadening of Cooperation"]

[Text] Berlin, 1 Nov -- GDR mass media are devoting great attention to the visit to the PRC by a GDR delegation headed by G. Kleiber, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers. It has been announced that the purpose of the visit is to hold talks on broadening economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. At the same time the press emphasized that G. Kleiber was received at the highest party and state level -- by Hu Yaobang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and by Wan Li, acting premier of the State Council.

KADAR ENDS UK TALKS, NOTES SIDES 'DIFFERED'

LD021842 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] London, November 2 TASS -- Talks ended here between Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, who is paying an official visit to Britain, and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary Geoffrey Howe and other officials.

Addressing a press conference, Janos Kadar said that the talks concentrated on the development of bilateral relations and also on international problems, and that the sides had differed on many questions.

Janos Kadar said that it was the obligation and duty of the governments of all countries to work for lessening international tension. As for Hungary and its allies, they made a clear and unequivocal statement to this effect at a recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries. Kadar said the socialist countries believed that there was a balance of forces between the two antagonist systems nowadays. That balance has to be preserved and equal security achieved at a lower level of armaments.

The Hungarian leader stressed the importance of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. The peoples of the world hope, he said, that the summit will have a beneficial effect on lessening international tension.

BILD PUBLISHES PARTS OF GORBACHEV LETTER TO KOHL

DW041041 Hamburg BILD in German 4 Nov 85 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Did Gorbachev Send His Letter to BILD?"]

[Text] BILD's [2 Nov] publication of parts of the secret Gorbachev letter to Chancellor Kohl created excitement in Bonn and Moscow. Government Spokesman Ost said on television that the letter probably came to BILD from Soviet sources. As always, the chief editorial board of BILD-ZEITUNG refuses to name the source -- be it in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn, in the Chancellary, in Moscow, in the Foreign Office, or elsewhere.

State Secretary Ost bases his theory on the fact that BILD printed only those passages of Gorbachev's letter that are critical for Bonn. Today BILD printed all the important passages of Gorbachev's letter, so that the public may make an objective assessment.

The Communist Party chief praises Soviet-German cooperation after the Moscow Treaty; he offers further treaties, for instance on scientific-technical cooperation; and he wants to take steps to safeguard peace.

Gorbachev to Kohl: The Letter

"Most esteemed Mr Chancellor: I have attentively studied your letter which was handed to me on 11 Sep by the FRG Ambassador. In the letter you indicate interest in continuing the political dialogue that we began in March this year on a broad range of current international problems.

"We have always advocated an active exchange of opinion with the FRG Government and with the governments of other Western European countries. In other words a businesslike and constructive dialogue that would contribute to the search for points of contact on basic problems of peace and security..."

Gorbachev goes on to say: "With our proposal (banning space weapons, reducing the number of missiles by 50 percent -- (editor) we have been striving to safeguard the best possible conditions to overcome the deadlocked process of negotiations on nuclear and space armament and to achieve agreements.

"Thus a real breakthrough would be achieved in the development of international relations from which peace, security, and cooperation would benefit. I think that we can expect, with justification, that the West will cover its part of the journey in response to our proposals.

"One would hope that the FRG Government would also make appropriate corrections in its attitude in view of new Soviet initiatives..."

The Communist Party chief then deals with intermediate-range missiles: "As you know, the Soviet Union has introduced a moratorium on deployment of its missiles of that class in Europe. Recently we exempted from the duty system those SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed in June 1984 as a reaction to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe.

"Simultaneously, the dismantling of the SS-4 missiles will be continued; we have already dismantled all SS-5 missiles. As a whole, the number of intermediate-range delivery systems in the European zone of the USSR is considerably lower than 10 or 15 years ago..."

Gorbachev deals with the U.S. SDI space weapons program: "As to space problems...the wish is rather clearly expressed in your letter to depict such a program as quite legitimate and integrated into the framework of the ABM treaty...

"Objectively, the situation in the field of disarmament is such that militarization of space would not only make the reduction of nuclear arsenals impossible, it would also create a dangerous arms race in every direction with really unimaginable consequences...

"I would like to hope that the FRG Government would act here in awareness of the responsibility it has assumed before its own and other peoples..."

Broad coverage is given to the European issue: "I have repeatedly stated in public, and I want to stress it again today, that the Soviet Union wants to participate actively in making Europe a continent of peace and mutually advantageous cooperation among all countries and peoples.

"As far as bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG are concerned I would like to note that we judge political objectives and intentions...primarily on the basis of their practical deeds. And if FRG policy is received in the Soviet Union, and in a number of other countries in a manner different from what Bonn desires, it is not our fault.

"The Soviet Union holds to its fundamental course. It is prepared to continue developing mutually advantageous cooperation with the FRG in the most diversified fields on the solid basis of the Moscow Treaty.

"We could examine yet some other practical issues broached in your letter, among them the question about the conclusion of work on the scientific-technical cooperation agreement.

"But not for a moment must the problems of security be put aside. They are indeed of determining significance for the East-West relationship as a whole and for the relations between the USSR and the FRG, as you yourself have acknowledged. The Soviet Union will duly appreciate all efforts of the FRG Government to safeguard peace and security in Europe and to discontinue the arms race.

"It would open broad new prospects to develop cooperation between our countries. The positive experiences we have had since the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty clearly testify to the fact that the Soviet Union and the FRG indeed can act as partners in solving the cardinal problems of the present...

"Very truly yours,"

SCOTTISH BUSINESS DELEGATION ENDS VISIT

LD021154 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 1 TASS -- Prospects of the development of business relations between Soviet foreign trade organizations and Scottish firms have been discussed in the course of the visit to the USSR of a delegation of Scottish business circles which ended today [1 Nov]. The delegation was headed by the Mayor of Glasgow Robert Gray and included representatives of 16 firms.

Our visit to the USSR was very much a success, Robert Gray said in a TASS interview. All the members of our delegation visited Moscow for the first time. The firms they represented were making their first attempt to penetrate the Soviet market, and one could hardly expect that any concrete results would be achieved at the negotiations started with the Soviet partners. This is why it is even more pleasant to point out that three of our firms have already managed to receive orders for the delivery of their products to the Soviet Union. We also hope that the present meeting will promote the increase of the purchases of Soviet goods by Scottish firms, R. Gray pointed out.

AGRICULTURAL PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH FINLAND

LD022303 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Helsinki, 2 Nov (TASS) -- Rayvo Oyassar, TASS correspondent reports: The 16th meeting of Soviet-Finnish working group on agriculture in the permanent intergovernmental Soviet-Finnish commission on economic cooperation completed its work here today. A protocol on the results of the meeting was signed. In this document the sides expressed satisfaction with the results of the implementation of the broad program of scientific and technological cooperation, which is being carried out on a friendly basis and which promotes the development of bilateral economic links. It was underlined that the main target of the cooperation is to assist the successful development of agriculture in both countries on the basis of an exchange of national experience in work and practice of agricultural production.

With the aim of further expanding and deepening cooperation and increasing its effectiveness, it is stressed in the protocol, the working group will continue work on finding solutions to problems which are of interest.

UK CONSERVATIVES' POLICY LEADS TO 'ADVENTURES'

LD020841 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 2 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The United States and Britain have reached accord on the principles of Britain's participation in the "star wars" program. This was announced in Brussels by British Defense Secretary Heseltine after his talks with the Pentagon chief Weinberger. Britain has thus become the first NATO country to agree to a role in the U.S. "star wars" program. The owners of British war corporations are happy in anticipation of fat profits from their contribution to the SDI. In particular, the White House has promised them at least 1.5 billion dollars for research related to the militarization of space. The accord will enable the British war business to start research in 18 key areas of the SDI program.

The Conservatives' foreign policy course is involving Britain in dangerous ventures, the purpose of which is to escalate the arms race and to spread it into outer space. Pursuing a pro-American policy, the Thatcher cabinet is working against the interests of the British people. The dangerous course of following the U.S. is absolutely at odds with the aspirations of the British population, who have launched a mass movement for nuclear disarmament with more than 170 anti-war organizations taking part. Britain's involvement in the program to militarize space is bound to lead to the further acceleration of the arms race, to an even worse destabilization of international relations and to Britain's greater dependence on its overseas partner.

It is alarming that during the Conservatives' tenure, Britain has become one of the more active NATO members and Washington's most loyal ally, unconditionally supporting the plans of war preparations of the U.S. Administration. After the Conservatives came to power, their approval of NATO's "two-track" decision, envisioning the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Britain and other West European countries, became one of the more dangerous manifestations of their militarist course. Small wonder that a tide of protests was provoked in the country by the Conservatives' policy of turning Britain into a launching site for U.S. nuclear-tipped missiles.

The Conservatives resort to gross pressure and outright blackmail to muzzle peace campaigners. However, their actions testify primarily to the strengthening of the anti-war movement and to the impotence of the reactionary forces to prevent the British people from struggling for the basic human right, the right to live.

UK CONCLUDES AGREEMENT ON SDI AT BRUSSELS MEETING

PM041627 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "Britain-United States: London Gives In"]

[Text] London -- People in the British Isles are concerned about the deal which Defense Secretary M. Heseltine has must concluded in Brussels.

There, Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger dictated to his British colleague the terms on which British firms can be given access to orders under the "star wars" program. This was the outcome of haggling which had lasted several months. In agreeing in principle to participate in SDI "research work," official London tried to make it conditional on contracts worth at least 1 billion pounds sterling right at the start. But the U.S. representatives demanded unconditional approval for the "star wars" program in exchange for vague promises regarding future orders. In the end, the Tory government in the person of M. Heseltine was forced to give in.

The "temporary" agreement concluded by the two defense secretaries during session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group does not define the sum of the possible contract for British companies, mentioning just "significant orders." This "compromise" accord must now be approved in London and Washington.

There is an indication in the British press that the U.S. will now receive from the British side all the technology they need but to not intend to admit them to their secret laboratories. They act according to the principle: What is mine is mine, and what is yours is also mine. The assurances of President Reagan, who granted an interview to a British radio company 30 October, that the United States will be prepared to "share" the achievements of SDI with all countries, sounds ridiculous. If they have put their most loyal and obedient ally in his place, what can we say about the others?

The British concessions in Brussels will evidently have serious consequences. The Tory government is one of the first U.S. allies to have, in point of fact, approved Reagan's "star wars" program or, at any rate, its first stage. This is emphasized, in particular, by the FINANCIAL TIMES, the newspaper of business circles, which notes the political nature of the agreement reached. By the way, people on the other side of the ocean have never concealed the fact that the United States must "talk around" official London on this question before the start of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Broad circles of the population in the British Isles feel great alarm in connection with Reagan's "star wars" program and demand that their government reject involvement in it. Troubled by these sentiments in Britain and other west European countries, in his radio interview addressed to the British R. Reagan tried once again to assure them that SDI is just a "defensive program," a new version of the nuclear "umbrella" -- this time a space one.

But people in Britain know what Washington really thinks about this. C. Weinberger has frankly stated that the "star wars" program must bring the United States the "nuclear first place," the MORNING STAR emphasizes in its commentary on the Brussels agreement.

SWEDISH SECURITY SERVICE FOLLOWS LEFTISTS

LD020732 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Stockholm, November 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

Over decades the Swedish special services have been filing the names of citizens having left views. This is confirmed again by the facts cited in the book by Swedish journalists Karl-Gustav Koehler and Bjarne Moelv entitled "Der Permanenta Komplotten; Asiktsregistrering Och Opinionstyrning" ("Permanent Conspiracy; Registration on the Basis of Views and Public Opinion Control").

It is noted in the book that back in the years of the Second World War Sweden's security service [words indistinct] private correspondence, millions of letters, and tapped as many telephone conversations. As many as 58 thousand communists and representatives of the left wing of social democracy were blacklisted on the strength of this. Many of them were thrown into special camps by the Swedish political police that had contacts with Gestapo.

In the sixties, the so-called "Information Bureau" continued registration on a large scale of citizens who were members of left organizations and parties. That secret intelligence service sent agents to penetrate trade unions in order to collect information about "the activity of communists and left in the working class movement". Despite the decision prohibiting the registration of citizens according to their views, the decision adopted by Riksdag (parliament) in 1968, the Swedish security police continued such activities and filed the names of 250-300 thousand people, among them activists of the movement of solidarity with the struggle of the Vietnamese people against the U.S. aggression, leaders of strikes.

The Department of Psychological Defence plays a special role in controlling attitudes of Swedish people, it follows from the book. The department's tasks, specifically, include "counteraction" to persons of left convictions and peace champions who, allegedly, erode "Swedes' moral readiness for defence".

Swedish newspapers reported more than once that those who caught the attention of secret services are denied employment with state enterprises and institutions and have no chances of promotion. Representatives of the democratic organizations. The progressive press of the country demand ever more persistently that an end be put to this disgraceful practice infringing rights of Swedish people.

DIPLOMATS KIDNAPPED IN BEIRUT RETURN TO MOSCOW

LD041727 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 4 TASS -- Three Soviet nationals, members of the USSR Embassy staff in Lebanon -- V. Myrikov, N. Svirskiy and O. Sirin -- who had been taken hostage in Beirut early in September returned to Moscow by an Aeroflot flight today. Upon arrival they expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Government and all those who worked toward their release.

FALASHA TRIAL IN SUDAN EXPOSES U.S. ROLE

LD021103 Moscow TASS in English 0643 GMT 1 Nov 85

[Text] Khartoum, October 31 TASS -- The U.S. unseemly role is becoming more clear at the trial which is under way here. The case under examination at the trial is the operation to take Falashas, a people in Ethiopia who are Jewish in religion, to Israel through the territory of the Sudan.

Delivering the indictment, the prosecutor general of the Sudan Omar al-Ati Omar has emphasised that the operation was drawn up and carried out jointly by the U.S. CIA and the Israeli intelligence service while the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum was a kind of the headquarters to direct that [word indistinct].

The examination in court brought to light additional proofs confirming the information which was collected during the preliminary investigation. From that information it is clear that the consent to take Falashas through the Sudanese territory was given by the former President Numayri of the Sudan. With Numayri being not at the trial, the main defendant, the chief of the now disbanded state security service O.M. al-Tayeb made a trip to Washington to discuss the concrete plan of the operation. He met with CIA Director William Casey from whom he received 2 million dollars for the operation. The court also received proofs showing direct involvement of a number of employees of the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum in ensuring flights of U.S. transport planes which took Falashas from the Sudan to Israel.

VARDZELASHVILI, IRAQI OFFICIAL DISCUSS RELATIONS

JN041450 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1232 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Baghdad, 4 Nov (INA) -- 'Abd al-Fattah Muhammad Amin, chairman of the Union of Iraqi Societies of Friendship With Peoples, today met with Omar Vardzelashvili, deputy chairman of the Georgia SSR Council of Ministers. Friendship relations between the two peoples and the areas for developing them were discussed during the meeting. The Soviet ambassador in Baghdad attended the meeting.

U.S., ISRAEL 'SABOTAGING' NEAR EAST SETTLEMENT

LD031007 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0435 GMT 3 Nov 85

["Encouraging Piracy" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Nov (TASS) -- "In sabotaging the search for a just Near East settlement, the United States and Israel would plainly like to maintain the hotbed of tension existing there," today's PRAVDA says.

In this connection the newspaper draws attention to the fact that "the Near East has altogether ceased to feature in the U.S. Administration's list of 'hot spots'."

"Such forgetfulness is all the more strange in that for many decades the Near East region has remained a dangerous hotbed of tension," the newspaper points out. "The cause of the chronic conflict there has been Tel Aviv's aggressive and expansionist policy that has the United States full support and complicity. As a result of these expansionist actions the south of Lebanon, the Golan Heights which belong to Syria, the Palestine lands of the West Bank and the Gaza strip, as well as East Jerusalem are under the heel of the occupiers. An entire people -- the Palestinian people -- have been deprived of their homeland, and their rights have been flouted by the Zionist invaders."

PRAVDA points out that the maintenance of tension in the Near East is being used by the imperialists and the Zionists as a pretext for their interference in the affairs of the Arab countries in their attempts to turn the region into their own military-strategic beachhead. All means and above all terror which has been promoted by Israel and the United States to the rank of state policy are being put to use. The prescriptions for separate "peace solutions" being advocated by the White House serve to enshrine the results of Israel's aggression.

"The Soviet Union," the newspaper stresses, "has repeatedly noted that a Near East settlement can be achieved only on the basis of a total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab territories which have been occupied since 1967, implementation of the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and the creation of its own independent state, and the guaranteeing of the right of all the region's states to an independent existence and development. A practical way to achieve this is the holding under UN auspices of an international conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization."

MOZAMBIQUE PARTY GOVERNMENT DELEGATION ARRIVES

PM051044 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[Text] A party and government delegation from the People's Republic of Mazambique led by Joaquim Chissano, a member of the Politbureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the Frelimo Party, minister of foreign affairs of Mozambique, arrived in Moscow 3 November at the invitation of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government.

At the airport the delegation was met by Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Boris Pnomarev, an alternate member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU L.F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister R.A. Ulyanovskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, USSR Ambassador to Mozambique Yu. F. Sepelev and other officials. Hipolra Patricio, ambassador of Mozambique to the Soviet Union, was among the welcoming party.

On the same day the delegation left Moscow for Leningrad.

Visits Leningrad

LD042342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] The party-government delegation from the People's Republic of Mozambique headed by Chissano, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Mozambique Liberation Front Party Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs, today became acquainted with the city on the Neva. A friendly conversation took place in the Leningrad Party obkom, where the guests were told about the basic directions of the Leningrad party organization's work, and about the successes with which the working people of Leningrad and its oblast are approaching the 27th CPSU Congress. The head of the delegation told of the struggle of his country's peoples against the subversive activities of imperialists and racists, and about the achievements of the republic's working people in various spheres of life. In the Smolnyy, members of the delegation viewed the V.I. Lenin memorial museum. At Piskarev memorial cemetery they paid tribute to the memory of Leningraders and soldiers who fell during the Great Patriotic War, and laid a wreath at the monument to the motherland.

E. AFRICAN LEADERS DISCUSS UGANDAN SITUATION

PM041015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Serbin report: "On the Situation in Uganda"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 27 Oct -- A meeting has taken place in Nairobi between Kenyan President D. arap Moi, Tanzanian President J. Nyerere, and General T. Okello, head of the Ugandan regime, to discuss the situation in Uganda. It took place on the eve of the next round of talks between representatives of the Ugandan government and the so-called National Resistance Army (NRA).

The Ugandan Government, formed after the July military coup, has not yet managed to reach agreement with the NRA at the talks being held in the Kenyan capital.

U.S. PROPOSES MORE AND FOR 'TERRORIST' UNITA

LD031436 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 3 Nov 85

[Text] New York November 3 TASS - By TASS correspondent M. Knyazkov:

The U.S. Administration has undertaken yet another step directed at legalizing the undeclared war against the People's Republic of Angola and broadening the conflict in southern Africa.

The U.S. Department of State has published a statement laying political groundwork for the Central Intelligence Agency's covert operations aimed to extend aid to the terrorist UNITA grouping which launches bandit raids inside Angolan territory from Namibia that is unlawfully occupied by South Africa. The document stresses the desire to assist UNITA. The statement also points out that the administration and Congress will resolve in the coming weeks the question on the way and means of assistance.

A White House official spokesman told THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper that the administration favours the beginning of the implementation of a large-scale programme of covert aid to the UNITA forces.

According to local observers, the State Department in fact gave the American special services the green light to conduct fresh terrorist operations against Angola. Preparations were launched in Washington long ago. Last summer U.S. Congress lifted the so-called Clark Amendment which formally banned the American Government's interference in the internal affairs of Angola. Following the elimination of this legal barrier, two bills were submitted simultaneously to the House of Representatives, providing for American military and other aid worth 27 million dollars to UNITA in the current fiscal year 1986.

All signs indicate that this is just a beginning. According to THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, the CIA and the Pentagon have devised a plan of launching an all-out war on Angola. 200-300 million dollars are to be spent on its implementation in the near future. Specific questions related to the implementation of the treacherous designs were discussed in Washington during last month's visit there by a UNITA chieftain, J. Chitunda.

According to the American press, the broadening of Washington's undeclared war against Angola reaffirms yet one more time that the Reagan administration coordinates its policy in southern Africa with racist-ruled South Africa which carries out endless armed raids inside Angolan territory. All this convinces the Americans that the United States acts at one with Pretoria, THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses in this connection.

Local observers point out that the State Department statement came immediately after President Ronald Reagan's address to the jubilee meeting of the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly in which he, resorting to demagogic appeals to the "resolution of regional conflicts", in fact set out the programme of eliminating revolutionary gains in several countries, including Angola.

SOUTH AFRICAN SECURITY SITUATION REVIEWED

LD041131 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] Botha, president of the racist Republic of South Africa [RSA] has issued a decree under which the police are released from all legal responsibility for any action taken while dispersing antiracist demonstrations and interrogating arrested people. At the same time, strict bans and limitations have been introduced in the RSA on the work of journalists, including foreign journalists accredited to the country. Nadezhda Ryasova comments on these reports.

The Pretoria regime wants to conceal the truth about the real situation in the state of apartheid from world public opinion. Why otherwise would it have banned television cameramen and press photographers from taking pictures of antiracist disturbances and reprisals against the opponents of apartheid? From now on, those who break the ban are threatened with imprisonment for a term of up to 10 years and a large fine, and in general journalists are ordered to work under strict police control so that the events taking place in South Africa get, as the racists put it, "truthful treatment." What this treatment should be was explained by Botha, the boss of the racist regime, in a speech at the end of last week in Johannesburg. He alleged that the efforts by Pretoria were aimed at building a peaceful life in South Africa for all groups of the population. But for some reason more and more people are being killed every day in a war that, as Le Grange, RSA minister of law and order, admitted, the police and the Army are waging in the African settlements. "We are winning," the minister boasted, "the police are busy up to their necks."

It was while preparing even more cruel punitive action that the Pretoria authorities decided to release the guardians of order from any responsibility for their bloody crimes. I should note that the new draconian measures in the RSA were taken immediately after the UN General Assembly strongly condemned the mass arrests and murders carried out by the racists. However, contrary to the opinion of the majority of the world community, Walters, the U.S. permanent representative at the United Nations, contrived to see in the preserve of racism and terror daily signs of the fact that the RSA is not a totalitarian society. He even saw there the beginning of reassuring changes. which is why, Walters said from the rostrum of the General Assembly, the United States does not consider justified the struggle by the South African population against the Pretoria regime, with which Washington intends to continue its policy of cooperation. The latest measures by the racist regime simply confirm that Pretoria and Washington are acting as one against the oppressed people of South Africa.

U.S. 'EFFRONTERY' TOWARD NICARAGUA DECRIED

PM041321 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Andrey Kamorin under the rubric "Publicist's Notes:; "A Mockery of Common Sense"]

[Text] U.S. President R. Reagan chose an "initiative for settling regional conflicts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America" as the central theme of his recent speech at the UN General Assembly jubilee session. He put forward a plan for their resolution as the chief prerequisite for ensuring "genuine peace." But the White House incumbent came up with a very peculiar interpretation of some well-known facts.

Take Central America, for example. R. Reagan said that all the trouble there was due to the "imposition of ideology from outside." This claim could serve as a splendid example of self-criticism: in the last 150 years the United States has "introduced ideology" into Central America on 60 occasions on Marine bayonets. It is at the very least naive of Washington to behave in that way and to expect slavish obedience from the region's peoples.

But let us leave history aside. The President's "initiative" named "talks among the warring parties" as the starting point for the settlement of conflicts. As far as Central America is concerned this means that the Nicaraguan Government is supposed to sit down at the negotiating table with the ringleaders of the "Contras," who are on the CIA payroll and are responsible for killing thousands of Nicaraguans. It is a degrading and unacceptable demand.

As the main warring (and bellicose) party in the Central American crisis, the United States is studiously avoiding what it has itself proposed. The United States demonstrated vigorous reluctance to conduct an equal dialogue with Nicaragua very recently. At a 29 October meeting with the Nicaraguan ambassador to the United States, H. Schlaudeman, the U.S. President's special representative in Central America, made the commencement of talks conditional on...the dissolution of the republic's National Assembly set up as a result of the general election last November. This is not only a case of supreme effrontery, but also a mockery of logic: the government of a sovereign state is being asked to outlaw itself!

If this move by Washington is seen as the first step on the path of implementing its "regional initiative," then it appears in its true light -- as imperial arrogance and flouting of the peoples' right to decide their own future.

FURTHER COMMENT ON DRAFT CPSU STATUTES

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial

PM051000 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Party's Fundamental Law"]

[Text] The draft CPSU Statutes with the amendments approved by the CPSU Central Committee October (1985) Plenum were published in the press yesterday. The CPSU Statutes are the fundamental law of party life. The closest and indissoluble link exists between them and the party program -- the CPSU's main theoretical and political document. The statutes provide organizational backup for the implementation of the party's program goals, define the forms and methods of its practical activity, the norms of party life, and the rights and duties of party members, and ensure the unity of all communists' will and actions. At all stages of its glorious historic road when creatively resolving the tasks that emerge, the party has developed the Leninist principles and norms of party life and improved its organization.

The amendments to the party statutes now being proposed by the CPSU Central Committee reflect the growth of its leading role in Soviet society's life. The draft scresses that the party is the nucleus of the political system and the leading and guiding force of Soviet society. It defines the general prospects for the country's development and ensures scientific leadership of the people's creative activity.

The growth of the scale and complexity of the tasks of communist building and the increased complexity of foreign political conditions in connection with imperialism's mounting aggressiveness make new high demands on the level of party leadership and dictate the need for new approaches to all aspects of party work. The draft statutes reflect the party's concern to increase the initiative and activeness of all its organizations and all communists in implementing the program goals for the planned and comprehensive improvement of socialism and Soviet society's further progress toward communism on the basis of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development.

Attaching fundamental importance to the unity of theoretical, political education, organizational, and economic activity, the party demands that communists firmly and unswervingly implement the party's general line and directives, explain the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy to the masses, organize working people to implement it, and promote the strengthening and expansion of the party's links with the people. Party members are obliged to develop criticism and self-criticism, to boldly reveal shortcomings and strive to eradicate them, to struggle against conceit, complacency, parochialism, departmental self-interest, and window-dressing, to give a resolute rebuff to any attempts to stifle criticism, and to oppose any actions damaging to the party and the state.

The development of the party is typified by the further growth and strengthening of party ranks and the improvement of intraparty relations on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism. Incorporating leading representatives of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia. The party is stepping up its influence on various sectors of communist building. The determining conditions for admission to the party have been and continue to be people's political and businesslike qualities, their honesty and probity, and their readiness to devote every effort to the communist cause.

The question of party membership is the fundamental question of party building. Following the Leninist behest to raise the title and importance of party members higher and still higher, the CPSU has always strictly monitored and continues to monitor the purity of its ranks. Now that with the growth of the party's prestige the responsibility of each communist for party membership has also risen, it is very important to defend party ranks from casual, unworthy people. To that end the draft statutes stress that a candidate's personal qualities are verified in practical acts and in the fulfillment of party and social assignments, and admission to the party takes place, as a rule, at open meetings.

The party's successful activity and the growth of communists' activeness are indissolubly linked with improvements in the work of primary party organizations. The proposed changes to the CPSU Statutes are vivid testimony to the party's concern to further raise its combativeness, prestige, and influence on all aspects of the life and activeness of collectives. The draft stresses the role of the primary party organization as the labor collective's political nucleus and the importance of increasing its responsibility for the resolution of tasks of economic and social development, production intensification, and the rational and economic utilization of material, labor, and financial resources.

The amendments and clarifications proposed for the CPSU Statutes are called upon to ensure the further expansion of intraparty democracy. They embrace the most important questions of party life -- from the development of the collectiveness of leadership and publicity in party affairs to cadre policy. They embody the party's line of asserting in the activity of each party organization the Leninist style of work -- a creative approach to the resolution of tasks, professionalism, the high responsibility and principledness of communists, and the fostering in them of the ability objectively and self-critically to assess the results that have been achieved and to take an attentive and sensitive attutude to people and their needs and requirements.

In the light of the party's present-day demands on the activity of all its components, Army and Navy primary party organizations are faced with important tasks. They are called upon to implement party policy in the Armed Forces, to rally the personnel around the Communist Party, and to educate servicemen in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist ideas and selfless devotion to the socialist motherland. It is important that the discussion of the draft CPSU Statutes with the proposed amendments should promote the further strengthening of the combativeness of Army and Navy party organizations and increase communists' vanguard role and creative activeness in the struggle to ensure high combat readiness and worthily greet the 27th Party Congress. The draft CPSU Statutes are convincing testimony to the creative development of the Leninist principles of party building and the use of the immensely rich experience accumulated by the party over the many years of its activity. Reflecting the demand of the time and embodied in the activity of the party and all its organizations and in the work of communists, the party's fundamental law will promote the further cohesion of its ranks, the strengthening of communists' prestige, and the intensification of the demands made on each of them for their attitude to their duty and for the honest and pure makeup of a party member. All this will ensure the further boosting of the CPSU's leading role in the Soviet people's struggle to implement the plans of communist creation.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editorial

PM041249 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Nov 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Right and Duty of a Communist" -- uppercase passages printed in boldface]

[Text] After studying a party document of tremendous political importance -- the draft new edition of the CPSU Program -- we all awaited with great excitement the publication of the draft party statutes with the proposed amendments.

And that is only natural. If the program, metaphorically speaking, is our compass in the systematic and all-around improvement of socialism and in Soviet society's subsequent advance toward communism, the statutes may justifiably be described as a tool for action to achieve the program goals. After all, for every one of us they are not simply a code of rules of a binding nature, but also a means of organization, a mighty weapon in the struggle for the practical implementation of impressive creative plans. Hence the intense interest in the draft.

Now that it has been published for general discussion, every Soviet person has a real opportunity to make a personal assessment of it and submit specific proposals concerning the draft at party meetings or in the press. This -- the broadest possible activeness by the masses -- is what the CPSU Central Committee is counting on in turning to all of us for advice and asking us to think about these milestone documents before the congress.

A very important distinctive feature of the draft statutes, as well as of the new edition of the CPSU Program, is the continuity of fundamental principles. The statutes sum up the experience of party work acquired by all generations of communists in our country and vividly reflect the established norms of party life and the immutable Leninist principles of membership, democratic centralism, collectiveness and internationalism. Let us begin with paragraph 1 of the draft statutes, which defines membership of the party. One cannot help rejoicing in the triumph of Lenin's perspicacious thoughts... History tells us about the stubborn struggle which broke out at the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress over precisely this highly fundamental proposition. Lenin's clear formulation that only a person who not only acknowledges the party program and statues, but also -- necessarily -- WORKS in a party organization can be a communist did not immediately become the inalienable norm. We will not now recapitulate the ins and outs of debates long ago; we will only stress one aspect which is extremely important in our day too. Insisting firmly on his version of the first paragraph, Vladimir Ilich affirmed that this is necessary so as to "separate the talkers from the workers." That is to say, from the very moment of our party's birth it attached paramount importance to ORGANIZATION, DISCIPLINE, ACTION. Can these demands be any less topical today? If we were to sum up the nature and purport of the proposed changes and amendments, it is in the desire for still greater genuine practical efficiency on the part of the entire party and each individual communist.

In the early 20th century, when the first statutes were being drawn up, the Russian proletariat and its combat vanguard, as V.I. Lenin acknowledged, had "no other weapon but organization in the struggle for power." We are in a different era now. In our country power has long been in the people's hands, and the Soviet state has a mighty economic, cultural, and spiritual potential and its ruling party has earned tremendous, undisputed prestige. But the significance of ORGANIZATION has by no means lessened; rather, it has increased a hundredfold. After all, in order to exercise its own role, the role of vanguard, in the new conditions, the party as a whole, like each of its members, has to know much, have many skills, and bear the responsibility for much. The draft version of the basic law of the party's life which has been submitted for discussion specifies the duties and rights of communists, the forms of organizational structure, the norms of intraparty life, and the methods of activity, proceeding on the basis of the URGENT REQUIREMENTS of the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and the improvement of the work style.

The draft statutes increase the demands on the party member. He is charged with the duty of setting an example of a CREATIVE attitude toward labor and of a high level of ORGANIZATION and DISCIPLINE. Today he must strive persistently for the improvement of production efficiency and the introduction of the achievements of science and technology into the national economy and must actively champion everything new and progressive. These provisions of the statutes are exceptionally important. Especially since as yet by no means all communists have become aware of their role and responsibility for technical and social progress.

By way of substantiation, let us cite the publication in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA of reports from sessions of the collegiums of a number of ministries which discussed the April and June (1985) decisions of the party Central Committee. It is no accident that the newspaper noted the inertia which still exists in the sector staffs themselves in terms of their approach to the problems of the scientific and technical renewal of production and their timidity in resolving the tasks of stepping up the intensification of production. At the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry collegium session, for instance, the following fact was cited. Last year and this year, 13 percent of the sector's enterprises, "according to Central Statistical Administration figures" (that is how they put it!), failed to plan any measures at all in the sphere of scientitic and technical progress. Yet each of these enterprises has its party organizations where many thousands of communists work. How can they be called champions of "everything new and progressive"? Naturally, other questions also arise: Why did party members on the sector staff itself "fail to notice" the unforgivable complacency of certain economic and technical leaders locally?

The draft statutes require every one of us to acquire the fighting qualities necessary both for the establishment of socialism's inherent principle of social justice, and for day-to-day work to implement economic and social development plans. Personal modesty and decency, sensitivity and attentiveness toward people those are the distinguishing features of a communist in our day. It must always be born in mind that no manifestation of conceit, arrogance, or self-importance will go unnoticed.

The draft statutes also orient us toward a resolute, uncompromising struggle against phenomena like departmentalism, window dressing, parochialims, the suppression of criticism, and so forth, which have become completely intolerable. The communist must proceed on the basis of statewide interests and display the necessary persistence and purposefulness for this. And it is no use whatever for individual party committees to adopt an innured pose following criticism or start displaying immoderate zeal for protecting the misconceived "honor of the uniform" or -- even worse -- for "protecting the authority" of a communist who has flagrantly compromised himself. Only recently, the newspaper has repeatedly put forward instances of refusal to accept criticism on the part of certain leaders of Ryazan Party Obkom and Balakovo Gorkom, but these cases have yet to receive a proper political assessment.

Paragraphs 9 and 12 of the statutes, which are concerned with the communist's responsibility for the fulfillment of the demands of the statutes and the observance of Soviet legislation, are also exceptionally topical and come from the very core of life. It is no use concealing the fact that the practice of discussing party members' offenses in private, which has become widespread in some places, has done nothing to promote the speediest elimination of their shortcomings in their work of personal behavior. And the enshrining in the statutes of the proposition that a communist who commits an offense answeres for it first of all TO THE PRIMARY PARTY ORGANIZATION, and that if he is called to party account by a higher organ the primary party organization is to be informed, will certainly help increase exactingness toward every party member.

The widening of the rights of primary organizations and the confidence which will be placed in them require greater boldness and maturity from the party collectives themselves. This obvious truth has to be mentioned, because it is by no means everywhere that the actions of communists, especially leaders, are discussed in a principled way.

A communist is always on view, people emulate him and follow his example. That is why the demands on him must always be stricter. "A party member," paragraph 12 says, "bears a dual responsibility for violation of Soviet laws -- to the state and to the party. Persons committing misdemeanors punishable by criminal proceedings are expelled from the ranks of the CPSU."

In recent years the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has repeatedly carried out comprehensive checks on the practice of examination of personal cases by party committees in various regions of the country and has studied the effectiveness of the educational significance of party penalties. In the course of this process many unseemly phenomena have emerged. In Tula Oblast it emerged that one in every five communists against whom criminal proceedings were taken remained in the party, for some reason. Things were no better in Maritime Kray, where one-fourth of the personal cases of communists called to account for abuse of their official position were examined without being discussed in the primary organizations. Attempts to avoid criticism and criminal responsibility were made in other places too. It is to be hoped that the new statutes will not only strike at those who violate party and state discipline, but also cool the ardor of their patrons.

In the proposed draft statutes the RIGHTS OF THE PRIMARY PARTY ORGANIZATION ARE CONSIDERABLY EXTENDED, as is the range of its urgent concerns. Today it is called upon to have greater weight in resolving the many urgent questions. There is also an increase in activeness in the implementation of cadre policy, the resolution of the task of intensification of production, the improvement of Soviet people's working and living conditions, and the stepping up of the labor collectives' role in the management of their enterprises and institutions.

...Difficult tasks face primary party organizations and every communist. Nobody will fulfill for us the plans and demands set out in the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU Program and Statutes. And it is very important that every one of us communists defines during the course of their discussion his own place in the implementation of these party documents, which are fundamental, revolutionary in spirit, and profoundly substantiated scientifically. Party committees must take every measure available to them to ensure that the discussion of the drafts immediately takes on a businesslike and constructive nature and takes place in an atmosphere of the utmost frankness, sincerity, and exactingness. It is necessary to resolutely cut short idle talk and the persisting desire for ostentation and unnecessary fuss. It is necessary to take care without fail to ensure that no useful proposal or valuable thought escapes the most concerned attention and careful consideration. All this will ultimately give energy and strength to each of us individually and to the party as a whole and will enable us to make the boldest designs and plans the realities of tomorrow.

CONSTRUCTION MISMANAGEMENT, EMBEZZLEMENT DISCUSSED

PM041423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Stepping up the Struggle Against Violations of Legality:]

[Text] A conference of workers in the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR Bank for Financing Capital Investments, and the USSR State Bank held 24 October in Moscow was devoted to stepping up the struggle against mismanagement, exaggerated reporting, and embezzlements in construction and increasing the role played here by the legal service and control and auditing administration.

It was noted that recently the construction ministries and organizations have taken definite measures to step up the struggle against violations of state discipline, mismanagement, and embezzlements. The standard of departmental control has improved and the work of make good the damage caused has improved.

At the same time, the conference stated, existing legislation is still not being utilized fully in the struggle against negative phenomena. Certain legal services of the construction ministries are having only a poor influence on strengthening state discipline and order, observing the policy of thrift, and ensuring the safe-keeping of socialist property.

The conference adopted recommendations for the improvement of the legal service's work in the sphere of the legal guaranteeing of control and auditing work.

SHEVARDNADZE SPEECHES PUBLISHED IN PAMPHLET

LD042147 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1624 GMT 4 Nov 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The Political Publishing House has produced a pamphlet entitled "For the Sake of a Lasting Peace on Earth and, in Space." In includes speeches by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnardze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, at the 40th United Nations General Assembly Session and at the festive meeting of the UN Security Council in September and October 1985.

PARTY, OTHER APPOINTEMENTS ANNOUNCED

First Deputy Broadcast Chairman

PM011658 Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL PERVYY in Russian No 28, 1985

[Text] Article 142: On the Appointment of Comrade L.P. Kravchenko as first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting

The USSR Council of Ministers resolves:

To appoint Comrade L.P. Kravchenko first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

N. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs at the USSR Council of Ministers The Kremlin, Moscow. 2 August, 1985. No 727.

Stavropol First Secretary

PM041635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 85 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent V. Pankratov report under general heading "Party Committee Plenums"]

[Text] Stavropol, 4 Nov -- A plenum of Stavropol CPSU Kraykom was held today to examine an organizational question.

The plenum relieved V.S. Murakhovskiy of the duties of first secretary of the party kraykom in connection with is appointement as first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

I.S. Boldyrev, who has worked as secretary of Stavropol CPSU Kraykom and recently as an inspector at the CPSU Central Committee, was elected first secretary of Stavropol CPSU Kraykom.

Khakass Obkom First Secretary

PM041649 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 85 First Edition p 2

[TASS report under general headline "Party Committee Plenums"[

[Text] Abakan, 4 Nov -- A plenum of Khakass CPSU Obkom held today examined an organizational question. The plenum relieved Ye.A. Yeliseyev of the duties of first secretary of the party obkom in connection with his transfer to other work.

O.S. Shenin, who has been working as secretary of Krasnoyarsk CPSU Kraykom, was elected first secretary of Khakass CPSU Obkom.

Kiev Obkom First Secretary 'Released'

LD041721 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 4 Nov 85

[Text] A plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Kiev Obkom was held today during which an organizational issue was examined. Comrade Tsybulko was released from duties as obkom first secretary in connection with his retirement on pension.

Comrade (?Revenko) who formerly worked as obkom second secretary, and has recently worked as deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work department, was elected Kiev Obkom first secretary.

Taking part in the work of the plenum was Comrade Titarenko, Ukrainian CP Central Committee second secretary.

Kirghiz First Secretary

LD021136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Nov 85

[Text] A plenum of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee took place today; it examined an organizational question.

The plenum released Comrade Usubaliyev from his duties as first secretary of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee in connection with his retirement on pension.

Comrade Masaliyev has been elected first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee. Formerly he worked as first secretary of the Issyk-Kul Obkom, and of late he has worked as a CPSU Central Committee inspector.

Kirghiz Forestry Committee Chairman

WA301200 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian on 15 October 1985 carries on page 1 an ukaz from the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium announcing that Turatbek Sultanovich Musuraliyev has been appointed to the post of chairman of the Kirghiz State Committee for the Forestry Industry.

Uzbek Friendship Society Chairman

WA010900 [Editorial Report] Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian on 19 October 1985 carries on page 1 a 100-word Uzbek TAG announcement titled "Plenum of the Uzbek Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations ith Foreign Countries" announcing the retirement of the former chairman of the society's presidium, I. Kh. Tokhtakhodzhayev, and the

ISRAELI ARTICLE CITED ON JEWISH EMIGRATION ISSUE

PM010951 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 22 October published on page 3 A 2,400-world article by Ya. Akshin under the heading "Playing at Repatriates, or How the Myth of the Oppression of Soviet Jews Has Suffered Yet Another Setback" giving an account of an article published in the JERUSALAM POST by Eytan Finkelshtyen, a Soviet Jew who has emigrated to Israel, who admits that "There is a gulf between the so-called 'fighters to leave the Soviet Union' and the main mass of Soviet Jews." Although it is an article of faith of Western propaganda that in the USSR "The so-called Jewish activist is a man whose life and whose relations' destiny are 'subject to terrible danger,'" Akshin writes, "In his article Finkelshtyen notes that there is no 'direct threat' to Soviet Jews in the USSR."

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW GORKIM GOSR MEETING

PM050843 [Editorial Report] Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 29 October front-pages a 1,500-word unattributed report under the heading "Moscow Greets the Great October Holiday." The report states: "A session of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom commission for preparing for the celebrations of the 68th anniversary of Great October in Moscow was held at the party gorkom yesterday under the chairmanship of V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom." It is reported that Grishin addressed the session.

AZERBAIJAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEMBER DIES IN ACCIDENT

WA011100 [Editorial Report] Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 20 October 1985 carries on page 3 a 400-word obituary of Siyavush Kudrat ogly Aliyev, first deputy director of of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee's Department of Propaganda and Agitation, who died in an automobile accident on 19 October. Aliyev was born in 1940. He graduated from the M. F. Akhundov Azerbaijan State Pedagogical Institute of Languages in 1963, and joined the CPSU in 1968. In 1970 and 1971 he was an inspector with the AzSSR People's Control Committee; his party work began in 1971 when he became an instructor in the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee's Organizational Party Work Department. In 1973 he was elected secretary of the Apsheronsk Rayon Party Committee. Aliyev studied at the CPSU Central Committee's Academy of Social Sciences from 1975 to 1978, successfully defending his dissertation. He returned to the Azerbaijan party apparatus in 1978 as an inspector with the Organizational Party Work Department. In 1980 he was elected first secretary of the Baku city party organization's Oktyabr Rayon Party Committee. In November 1984 he was appointed first deputy director of the Azerbaijan CP Cental Committee's Department of Propaganda and Agitation. Aliyev was named a member of the Azerbaijan CP Auditing Commission at the party's 30th Congress. The obituary is signed by K.M. Bagirov, O.A. Bagirov, G.A. Gasanov, S.Ch. Kasumova, V.N. Konovalov, T.A. Namedov, R.E. Mekhtiyev, F.E. Musayev, G.N. Seidov, S.B. Tatliyev. K.A. Khalilov, Z.M. Yusif-Zade, B.S. Kevorkov, D.M. Muslim-Zade, N.E. Mustafayev, L.Kh. Rasulova, G.Sh, Efendiyev, F.G. Akhmedov, N.A. Mamedov, A.F. Dashdamirov, R.D. Mamedov, V.M. Guli-Zade, N.A. Akhundov, Ya.M. Kirsanov, B.A. Mirzadzhanov, N.S. Sadykh-Zade, M.Ya. Kaziyev, A.N. Abbasov, N.Kh. Akhmedov, and F.A. Khaspolatov.

BRIEFS

TRACTOR MINISTER DECORATED -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor to Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Yezhevskiy, USSR Minister of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building. This is to mark his great services to the Soviet State and his 70th birthday. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 2 Nov 85 LD]

TAJIK ALCOHOLISM CLINIC -- The help is being rendered by a drugs specialist. To help people to get rid of alcohol-addicition is a task performed by specialists of the part-time drying-out clinic [narkologicheskiy polustatsionar] which has been opened at brick works in the Tajik town of Kalininabad. It is situated near the enterprise, which has allotted some under-roof space for it. In the course of the three-month treatment period, patients come here both before work and after their shifts are finished. The advantage of such treatment form is that it does not require to stop one's labor activities, it does not take people away from their families. The work of the durg-specialists has made it possible to significantly reduce cases of workers showing up for work in the state of inebriation, to eradicate absenteeism. Scientists of the department of the psycho-therapy of the Tajik "Avicenna" Medical Institute are initiators of creation of such establishments. At present, the Tajik drying-out service includes a republican and three oblast clinics, 30 specialized rooms and a network of medical attendant's drying-out stations at industrial enterprises. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 2 Nov 85 LD]

UZBEK RED CRESCENT SOCIETY -- The Uzbek SSR Red Crescent Central Committee held a plenum in Tashkent on 22 October. The meeting discussed the question of organization. Comrade (Akram Koluben) was elected chairman of the Uzbek SSR Red Crescent Society Central Committee. Due to his appointment to another post, the plenum relieved Comrade Sharifbayev from his responsibilities as the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Red Crescent Society Central Committee Comrade Abdullayeva, secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the work of the plenum. [Text] [Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 0215 GMT 23 Oct 85 GF]

ARKHANGELSK OBLAST TV RELAY -- The State Commission has accepted a Moskva satellite communications station in the town of Kotlas. The inhabitants of this town and of dozens of neighboring villages will be able to pick up two television programs from Moscow. Now the assembly of more low-power relay stations for television programs is being carried out at far-flung shelters for fishermen and deer-breeders, and also for rural geologists at polar stations. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 3 Nov 85 LD]

CSA ON POTATO, COTTON PROCUREMENT PROBLEMS

LD310314 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Oct 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Gathering of the harvest is coming to an end in the country. According to data of the USSR Central Statistical Administration on 28 October winter crops had been sown on almost 37 million hectares. Fallow land has been plowed on an area of more than 96 million hectares. Gathering of late vegetables continues. But it is still a long way to the fulfillment of the plan for their procurement. A tense situation has come about in the harvesting of potatoes in a number of farms of the Non-Chernozem Region. Alarm signals are coming in from Novosibirsk Oblast, where thousands of metric tons of cabbage and carrots are still in the fields.

The cotton growers have had a fruitful year. More than 7.5 millions tons of raw cotton have been procured. However, the organization of the harvesting still does not meet the requirements of intensification.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 31 OCT-2 NOV

LD030440 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 31 October-2 November 1985. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

31 October

Farmers in Namangan Oblast in Uzbekistan are completing the cotton harvest, and have gathered almost 430,000 tons of raw cotton. (0500)

The weather conditions for cotton picking have worsened somewhat in Central Asia in the last few days. However, the crops continue to come in. The USSR Ministry of Agriculture reports that over 7.7 million tonnes have so far been gathered in. About 900,000 tons of fine-fiber cotton have been picked. Plowing is underway on land freed from harvesting. Central Asian farmers are also completing harvesting of soya, rice and certain other late crops. (0304)

Lipetsk Oblast sugar beet growers fulfilled their socialist pledges. A total of 1.9 million beet roots were sent to procurement points which is by 200,000 tons more than planned. (0900).

Overall the harvest of sugar beet is practically over. Procurement of beet is being done in an organized manner in Lithuania as well as in Kurst, Belgorod Saratov Oblasts and many other regions of the RSFSR. Many front-ranking farms have a good yield. However front-ranking experience is being spread very slowly and is hindered by departmental demarcations. Beet factories are under the Ministry of the Food Industry and must deduct part of their profits for state and collective farms. This problem must be resolved as soon as possible for production to increase. (1200)

Tea-growers of Georgia have picked and handed over to processing plants a little over 580,000 tons of tea, which is 3,000 tonnes than the record harvest of last year. (1430).

1 November

ambo Oblast has procured 150,000 tons of sugar beet so far. (1900)

2 November

ashkir ASSR is one of the RSFSR's top milk-producing areas: The republic's farmers ave delivered over 5 million tonnes of it to the state, prefulfilling the 5-year lan. (0200)

orrespondent interviews Vladimir Ivanovich Ostapov, Director of the Ukrainian cientific research institute of irrigated farming, and participant of the recent ASKhNiL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences Named After Lenin] session. e says that in the Ukraine there are already 4.3 million hectares of irrigated land, hich is 6.6 percent of land under the plow. This yields around 14-15 percent of ross output, i.e. each irrigated hectare is worked at a rate 2.5 - 3 times more ields on irrigated land further still. (0200)

oldavian corn growers are preparing seeds for spring sowing. Ivan Petko reports rom the largest corn calibrating works, which sends more than 10,000 tons of selected eeds to Belorussia, the Baltic republics and other areas. The republican scientific roduction association Gibrid works closely with the works. Savva Konstantinovich Arnava, andidate of agricultural science, director of the association, says that they have red new hybrids for more northerly areas. The Moldavskiy-102 and Zhiletkov-3-86 re already well known but they do not ripen quickly. This year hybrids with higher nd faster ripening yields are on offer. One is called Nema, meaning non-Chernozem-oldavia for the non-Chernozem Zone; another is Bema, for Belorussia, and a third ima, meaning Vinnitsa-Moldavia. They ripen faster than those being grown so far, and han those being cultivated and dispatched up to now. (1900)

IZVESTIYA DRAWS LESSONS FROM TAJIK EARTHQUAKE

PM311336 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Surkov report under the rubric "Returning To What Was Published": "Kayrakkum: Life Returns to Normal"]

[Text] Leninabad Oblast -- Those fateful minutes when very strong tremors from deep within the earth made many thousands of families in Tajikistan's Leninabad Oblast homeless, disordered their creative labor, and damed or destroyed production premises (IZVESTIYA Nos. 288 and 290) are still fresh in our memory. Today not one of the people who suffered the calamity remains out in the open. Towns of tents and wooden panelboard huts have grown up in Kayrakkum, Gafurov, and the villages of Khodzhentskiy Rayon, which found themselves at the epicenter of the destruction. Iron stoves with a fuel supply, gas cookers, and electric lights are being installed in all the temporary dwellings. Mobile food and manufactured goods stores have been opened everywhere. Along with the dining rooms which survived intact, hot food is being provided continuously by field kitchens. A supplementary network of medical centers and pharmacies has been deployed. People are returning to active work on construction sites, at industrial enterprises, and in the cotton fields.

Two weeks... The normal rhythm of all-conquering life is being restored, albeit with difficulty and complexity. Staffs to eliminate the after math of the earthquake are operating round the clock in the affected regions and in Leninabad. A special government commisssion has been set up in the republic. it is headed by G. Pallayev, chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The intensive work of the staffs and the commission and of republic ministries and departments is directed toward the speediest rehabilitation of the national economy. Railroad trains are travèling to Leninabad from all ends of the country with equipment, construction materials, coal, and fuel. Consignments of warm clothes, food, and medical supplies have arrived. They have been sent from Moscow, Tashkent, Frunze, Samarkand... As previously, our peoples' fraternal mutual assistance is unfailing.

The Tajik USSR's multinational collectives are also making what contribution they can to the restoration. They have resolved to transfer a day's pay to the victims' aid fund. Everything is being done in the republic to make up for the enforced interruption in production. This is the first response to the disaster. But life also demands other measures of a long-term nature stemming directly from comprehension of what has happened. Specialists are saying today that the elements have turned the cities of Kayrakkum and Gafurov and the population centers of Khodzhentskiy Rayon into a graphic proving ground where we must learn to erect residential, administrative, and production buildings with regard to the possible seismic danger.

In Kayrakkum 90 percent of multi-story brick buildings were wrecked. No repairs can restore them, and they must be built anew. Why did this happen? They were created to withstand less intense earthquakes, and did not stand up to this test. And the picuture was similar at the carpet association's factories. The first-phase buildings, contructed in the fifties, collapsed, but the association's second phase, erected later and with a greater reserve of strength, survived by and large. Its blocks are being repaired.

How is construction to proceed now?

Everyone is of the same opinion in this regard: We must not cut costs in the construction of buildings at the expense of reducing their strength.

fortunately, that was what happened. Here is documentary proof of this. The thick me "Earthquake Prediction" lies on my desk. It is the first number of an anthology blished by Tajik seismologists in 1982. There is a chart of the republic's seismic gions on page 28. To judge from this, Leninabad Oblast is in a zone of force-7 and 8 rthquakes. Previously, the whole of northern Tajikistan was considered only a force-7 gion. The force-8 tag was established with great difficulty. Workers of the republic sstroy resisted it for a long time. But even after that faults in construction and ilure to observe the norms of earthquake resistance led to new construction projects ing unprepared for a force-8 quake. And old buildings -- those of the carpet factory, r example -- were never strengthened according to the new requirements. Today, how-er, the accepted thesis is out of date: The intensity of the destructive shocks in yrakkum exceeded force 8. Thus, new structures there must be designed for at least rce 9.

ssons of the seismic storm... There are many of them. Here is one more. The adobe llage of Koptulyuk near Kayrakkum collapsed. All its inhabitants have been evacuated. new village has to be constructed. What should it be like? Are the old type of uses to be repeated? They might collapse again. Life itself suggests that both in e cities and in rural regions it is necessary to carry out real earthquakeproof cons-uction and categorically prohibit the erection of any structures without regard to ismic impacts. The disaster was first presaged by the variable luminescence of the ght sky, which appeared now like the flames of a distant fire, now like a reflection the departed sunset. Then everything was plunged into darkness. The luminescence curred approximately 90 minutes later, and the underground storm broke. Everyone is w pondering on that phenomenon. It is the opinion of scientists that a not yet fully vined natural phenomenon was being observed. But ordinary eyewitnesses clearly sert that the luminescence was the last harbinger of the earthquake and the companion the seismic storm which had already sprung up.

me will show who is right, but it is possible to assert right now that, owing to the perfection of means of communication with the Central Asian Earthquake Prediction nter in Dushanbe, the seismology service was unable to pass on information about the slaught being prepared by the elements and, thus, to obtain in time computer-processed te on the epicenter and the force of the shock. And how could it have do so, when ningabad Oblast has a very weak network of seismic stations. Here is information from e republic Central Statistical Administration and Academy of Sciences. It attests that e-third of Tajikistan's population lives in Leninabad Oblast. But this densely popu-ted zone has just 3 low-power seismic stations out of the 30 located on the republic's rritory. The large city of Leninabad -- incredible but true! -- does not have any rvice at all for observing the underground elements.

conversation with me A. Belyayev, chairman of Leninabad Oblispolkom, recalled that rrible night hour when a general shaking of tremendous force brought to their feet ose who were awake and those who were asleep, the healthy and the sick. Belyayev aped out of the bath and,hardly stopping to pull on some clothes, ran to the ispolkom. lephone communications with a whole number of regions had been impaired. In which of em had the greatest misfortune occurred? It was only possible to guess. The epicen-r of destruction was established only after couriers had dashed to Leninabad from yrakkum and Gafurov.

e conclusion is clear: The number of seismic stations here must urgently be at least ubled, and they must be provided with modern apparatus and the necessary devices. r Leninabad Oblast is located on the Fergana faults, where strong shocks from the rth's interior destroyed the settlements of Oftobruy and Pap several years ago. The lamity must not be repeated.

ARKHIPOV ADDRESSES ANNIVERSARY PARADE TROOPS

LD312100 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1640 GMT 31 Oct 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A solemn meeting of participants in the forthcoming Red Square military parade by troops of the Moscow garrison in honor of the 68th anniversary of the October Revolution has been held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Taking part in the meeting were commanders, representatives of party, Komsomol and Soviet organizations, and the capital's public. Combat banners of units and formations taking part in the parade were carried into the hall before the assembled motor riflemen, artillerymen, members of launcher detachments, and pilots, many of whom came directly to Moscow from tactical operations. Colonel General Arkhipov, commander of the troops of the Order of Lenin Moscow Military District, spoke at the meeting.

CEREMONIAL MEETING OF GOSR PARADE TROOPS HELD

PM021350 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Zhitarenko report: "Meeting of Parade Participants"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of participants in the forthcoming 114th military parade on Red Square was held yesterday in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

The meeting presidium comprised V.I. Drugov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Administrative Organs Section; Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister; V.M Borisenkov, secretary of Moscow party Obkom; L.I. Matveyev, secretary of Moscow party Gorkom; Lieutenant General V.S. Nechayev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Colonel General M.D. Popkov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Ground Forces Political Directorate; Colonel General of Aviation L.L. Batekhin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Air Forces Political Directorate; Admiral P.N. Medvedev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Navy Political Directorate; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, commander of the Airborne Assault Troops; and other comrades.

The meeting was opened by Colonel General I.P. Repin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Order of Lenin Moscow Military District Political Directorate. A report on the 68th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was delivered by Colonel General V.M. Arkhipov, commander of the Moscow Military District. The servicemen were warmly congratulated on the approaching holiday by Hero of Socialist Labor A.P. Yevstigneyev, a worker at the First Moscow Watch and Clock Plant; L.I. Udovichenko, meritorious artist of the RSFSR; twice Hero of the Soviet Union Colonel L.D. Kizim; and D.A. Okhromiy, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

The participants in the ceremonial meeting adopted with great enthusiasm a greetings letter to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev.